FINAL REPORT

MID-TERM EVALUATION

OF THE

BIODIVERSITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

OF THE

CONSERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY PROJECT

(936-5554)

Delivery Order No. 5
under
IQC PDC-0085-I-00-9087-00

Prepared by

Roy Hagen and John N. Shores

with

John O. Wilson

AID/LAC/DR/E Deputy Environmental Officer

October 21, 1991

TvT Associates

BASIC PROJECT DATA

1. Country or Office:

   Science and Technology/Forestry, Environment, and Natural Resources (R&D/ENR as of 1 October 91)

2. Project Title:

   Biodiversity Support Program component of the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project

3. Project Number:

   936-5554

4. Project Dates:

   a. Project Paper: 09 June 1988
   b. Cooperative Agreement: 30 September 1988, expiration 1993
   c. Final Obligation Date: FY1997
   d. Most Recent Project Assistance Completion Date: FY1998

5. Project Funding:

a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding	US$ 28,400,000
b. Other Major Donors	US$ 0
c. Host Country Counterpart Funds	US$ 0
Total	US$ 28,400,000

6. Mode of Implementation:

   Cooperative Agreement (DHR-5554-A-00-8044-00) between A.I.D. and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). WWF is the lead agency in a consortium of WWF, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and World Resources Institute (WRI).

7. Project Designers:

   A.I.D./S&T/FENR
   WWF
   WRI
   TNC
   Robert Nathan Associates

8. Responsible A.I.D. Officials:

a. S&T/FENR Director(s):	John Sullivan (retired) Twig Johnson
b. Project Officers:	Molly Kux (concept and design) Dan Deely (Acting) Seymour Sohmer

9. Previous Evaluation(s): None

MID-TERM EVALUATION
OF THE
BIODIVERSITY SUPPORT PROGRAM

CONTENTS

FIGURES

ATTACHMENTS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAAS	American Association for the Advancement of Science
AFR	A.I.D. Regional Bureau for Africa
A.I.D.	Agency for International Development (see also USAID)
ANE	Asia and the Near East (former A.I.D. Regional Bureau, now separated into ENE and APRE)
AOC	Advise of Charge
APRE	Asia and Private Enterprise (A.I.D. Regional Bureau)
ARTS	Analysis, Research, and Technical Support (formerly AFR/TR)
AWF	African Wildlife Foundation (formerly AWLF)
BCD	Biological and Conservation Data System (of TNC)
BDFF	Biological Diversity of Forest Fragments (formerly MCS)
BIFAD	Board on International Food and Agriculture Development
BOSTID	Board on Science and Technology for International Development (of NRC)
BSP	Biodiversity Support Program (part of CBD Project)
B/G	Borrower/Grantee
Buy-in	Funding allocated to a Project or Agreement from another Project, usually from a Bureau or Mission
CA	Cooperative Agreement
CAGCC	Central Africa Global Climate Change Project
CARE	CARE, International
CBD	Conservation of Biological Diversity Project (S&T Project 936-5554)
CDC	Conservation Data Center (of TNC)
CDSS	Country Development Strategy Statement
CGBD	Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
CI	Conservation International
CIDE	Center for International Development and Environment (of WRI)
CITES	Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora
CMC	Center for Marine Conservation
COB	Close of Business
CRM	Coastal Resources Management (S&T Project 936-5518)
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
DESFIL	Development Strategies for Fragile Lands (S&T Project 539-5438)
DFA	Development Fund for Africa (of A.I.D.)
ENE	Europe and the Near East (A.I.D. Regional Bureau)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency (of US)
EPAT	Environmental Policy and Training (S&T Project)
EPM	Environmental Planning and Management (S&T Project 936-5562)
ESF	Economic Support Fund
ExCo	Executive Committee (of BSP)
FAA	Foreign Assistance Act (of US)

FARA	Food, Agriculture, and Resource Analysis (of AFR)
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization (of UN)
FENR	Forestry, Environment, and Natural Resources (part of S&T, now ENR of R&D)
FEWS	Famine Early Warning Systems (Africa Bureau Project)
FORESTA	Forest Resources for a Stable Environment (LAC Regional Bureau Project 515-0243)
FRM II	Forest Resource Management Project: Part II (S&T Project 936-5556)
FSP	Forestry Support Program (USDA Forest Service)
FY	Fiscal Year
GA	Government Agency
GBS	Global Biodiversity Strategy (WRI-IUCN-UNEP)
GCC	Global Climate Change
GEF	Global Environment Facility (World Bank, sometimes Environmental)
GIS	Geographic Information System
GPS	Global Positioning System
HB3	A.I.D. Handbook 3
HB13	A.I.D. Handbook 13
HC	Host Country
HCC	Host Country Contract
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICBP	International Council for Bird Preservation
ICDP	Integrated Conservation and Development Project
ICRW	International Center for Research on Women
IDB	Interamerican Development Bank
IFAR	International Fund for Agricultural Research
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IIED-NA	IIED-North America (now WRI-CIDE)
IN	Information and Evaluation Networking
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (also "World Conservation Union")
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean (A.I.D. Regional Bureau)
MANRES	Management of Natural Resources and Environment for Sustainable Development (A.I.D./Thailand Project 493-0345)
MBG	Missouri Botanical Garden
MCC	Minimum Carrying Cost (A.I.D. budgetary term)
MCS	Minimum Critical Size Project (Amazonia, now BDFF)
MIS	Management Information System
NAS	National Academy of Science (of US)
NECTARI	Nepal Conservation Training and Research Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRC	National Research Council (of US)
NRMS	Natural Resources Management Support (AFR Project 698-0467)

NSF	National Science Foundation (of US)
OAS	Organization of American States
ONI	Operations and New Initiatives (of AFR Bureau)
OPG	Operational Program Grant
OTA	Office of Technology Assessment (of US Congress)
OTS	Organization for Tropical Studies
OYB	Operating Year Budget
PA	Protected Areas (National Parks and Similar Reserves)
PACA	Programa Ambiental para Centro América (CARE-CI-TNC Consortium)
PARTS	Policy Analysis, Research, and Technical Support (Africa Regional Bureau Project for FY92)
PASA	Participating Agency Services Agreement
PC	Peace Corps
PCV	Peace Corps Volunteer
PD	Pilot Demonstration
PEP	Profitable Environmental Protection (A.I.D./South Pacific Project)
PIAC	Project Implementation Advisory Committee (for BSP)
PID	Project Identification Document
PIO/T	Project Implementation Order/Technical Services
PM	Project Manager (of A.I.D.)
PNRM	Plan for Supporting Natural Resources Management in Sub-Saharan Africa
PP	Project Paper
PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
PY	Project Year
R&D	Research and Development (new name for S&T as of 1 Oct 91)
RE	Research
REDSO	Regional Economic Development Support Office (Africa Region)
RENARM	Regional Environmental and Natural Resources Management (LAC/ROCAP Project 596-0150)
RFA	Request for Application for Assistance
RFP	Request for Proposals
ROCAP	Regional Office for Central America and Panama (of A.I.D./LAC)(sometimes ... Central American Programs)
RRC	Research Review Committee (of BSP)
S&T	Bureau for Science and Technology (of A.I.D., now R&D)
TA	Technical Assistance
TFAP	Tropical Forest Action Plan and Tropical Forestry Action Programme
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
TR	Training
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme

USAID	US Agency for International Development
WB	(World Bank, see IBRD)
WCI	Wildlife Conservation International
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WID	Women in Development
WRI	World Resources Institute
WRI/CIDE	Center for International Development and Environment (of WRI)
WWF	World Wildlife Fund or Worldwide Fund for Nature (see also WWF-US)
WWF-US	World Wildlife Fund - United States

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Office

Bureau for Research and Development / Office of Environment and Natural Resources (AID/R&D/ENR, formerly AID/S&T/FENR)

Title

Mid-Term Evaluation of the Biodiversity Support Program of the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project (936-5554)

Date of Report

21 October 1991.

Purpose of the Project or Program

The Problem Agency policy, Congressional mandates, and non-governmental and scientific reports call for increased attention to conservation of biodiversity.

The Proposed Solution The Conservation of Biological Diversity (CBD) Project has five components: (1) Technical Assistance, (2) Research, (3) Training, (4) Information Exchange and Evaluation, and (5) Pilot Demonstrations. The activities provide a sound scientific and technical base for biodiversity investments by A.I.D., other donors, and host-country institutions. The Biodiversity Support Program (BSP),part of the CBD project, is oriented to the delivery of assistance to developing country governments and private organizations to help them perceive and act on the problems and opportunities for biological conservation in their own settings.

Opportunities An important opportunity seized by this program is a preponderant capability in international biodiversity conservation that resides in conservation NGOs. In addition, this program reaches beyond the three immediate members of the joint-venture to involve the broader conservation and development community.

Goal and Purpose "[T]he goal of this project is to conserve biological diversity and to promote sustainable economic development in developing countries through better conservation and use of biological resources. The purpose is to improve the capacities of non-governmental and governmental institutions in A.I.D. partner countries and of A.I.D.-

assisted programs to identify the critical needs for and economic potential of, conservation and wise management of biological resources, through safeguarding ecological processes, and maintaining the variety of genetic resources." [sic] (Cooperative Agreement:1)

Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used

This mid-term evaluation was prescribed in the Project Paper and in the Cooperative Agreement creating the program. The purpose of the evaluation, as described in the Scope of Work, "is to review progress made by the Biodiversity Support Program in implementing a component of the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project." The evaluation was to assess implementation, effectiveness, and management, and if necessary, to recommend modifications to strengthen future implementation.

The methodology for the evaluation was primarily document review and interviews in Washington, DC. Field input was collected through questionnaires and telephone follow-up. No site visits were made.

Findings and Conclusions

The Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) has been an extraordinarily successful program. Regional Bureau and Mission feedback has been very positive. BSP was ranked in the highest category of all S&T/FENR projects in 1990 and again in 1991. BSP ranks among the highest of all A.I.D. projects for the rate of buy-ins from Bureaus and Missions.

BSP has been very successful in reaching beyond the immediate members of the joint venture to the broader conservation and development community. More than 50 separate institutions have been involved as direct participants in roughly 100 activities, plus 45 individuals in small grant research activities. More than 60 countries have participated.

BSP has undertaken a broad range of activities. These have been completed in a timely fashion and have been of high quality. On the other hand, there has not been a strategic focus to the individual components, nor have the linkages between components and activities been articulated.

Recommendations

BSP has an opportunity to shape the issues and questions regarding biodiversity through deliberate steps to assess, monitor, evaluate, and summarize these efforts around the world. Disseminating the lessons learned in a regular series of publications and public meetings could place BSP on the crest of the wave in

biodiversity conservation, particularly with regard to timely topics such as buffer zone management or integrated conservation and development projects. BSP should develop a strategic plan that will enable the program to contribute to these broader goals in a deliberate and focused way.

The Evaluation Team recommended increased core funding for the Information Networking and Technical Assistance components, and no change in core funding for the Research and Training components.

The BSP could have benefited from a strategic planning process and a written action plan.

Lessons Learned

BSP has been successful in contributing to the conservation of biodiversity in spite of, or because of, a deliberately vague project design. A.I.D. in effect placed its faith in the members of the joint venture to build an appropriate program. The selection of the member PVOs for the joint venture and the deliberate effort to avoid an over-prescribed design resulted in a flexible program and committed staff. One lesson is that an appropriate challenge to the right organizations can be as effective as a detailed design.

BSP could have been even more effective, and could have been more self-adjusting, if strategic planning had become part of regular operating procedures.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

The Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) is one result of the rapid growth in concern and funding for the conservation of biological diversity that developed in the United States during the 1980s.

> "Recognizing the importance of biological diversity to economic development, Congress has repeatedly amended the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) [of 1961] with Sections 117, 118, and 119 to include concerns for the conservation of natural resources, biological diversity, and tropical forests. Congress earmarked US$ 2.5 million in the fiscal year 1987 A.I.D. budget for biodiversity-related projects. Under the FAA mandate, the conservation of biological diversity is a growing and explicit focus of A.I.D.'s environmental activities. Funding for biodiversity conservation has steadily increased since 1985, putting A.I.D. into a leadership role within the international donor community." (AAAS Fellows' Working Paper:3)

Section 118 authorizes A.I.D. to increase its efforts to conserve biological diversity, particularly focusing on tropical forest habitats. Section 119, entitled Endangered Species, states that "the preservation of animal and plant species .. should be an important objective of U.S. development assistance." A.I.D. issued new "Policy Determinations" on natural resources and forestry early in this period (1983).

In 1987, A.I.D. had little project experience or professional staff in the field of biodiversity. Initial biodiversity activities funded by A.I.D. were often accomplished *ad hoc* with little coordination or strategic thinking. The Science and Technology (S&T, now Research & Development) Bureau's principal involvement in biodiversity in 1987 consisted of a buy-in to the ongoing Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) Project under a Cooperative Agreement with IIED. Regional Bureaus generally responded to the Congressional directive by establishing grant programs for biodiversity.

A long-term approach that expanded on available resources was needed. Molly Kux of S&T took the lead in identifying an appropriate mechanism for addressing biodiversity issues. The preponderant capabilities in the conservation of biodiversity on the international level lay outside of A.I.D., primarily with the environmental PVOs. Furthermore, the number of these PVOs working internationally at a significant scale was relatively limited.

The concept that led to the creation of BSP was developed jointly by a number of persons. Among the principal actors were: Molly Kux of AID/S&T, Walter Arensberg of the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED,

now part of WRI), Alan Randall of The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and Michael Wright of the World Wildlife Fund-US (WWF). It was felt that S&T could most effectively help fulfill A.I.D.'s mandate under Section 119 by supporting, and by gaining the support of, the PVOs that were already the most active internationally in the conservation of biodiversity.

The list of PVOs eventually came down to WWF, IIED, and TNC. WWF was seen as the largest environmental PVO with global operations and mostly independent funding. IIED was also international in scope, with particular strengths in environmental policy and planning. It was already the recipient of the EPM Cooperative Agreement from S&T, generally considered a successful project. TNC had strong overseas involvement, focusing on Latin America and on Conservation Data Centers (CDCs).

BSP was funded as an A.I.D. Cooperative Agreement (CA) with WWF, under the S&T Conservation of Biological Diversity (CBD) Project (936-5554). The original Project Paper (PP) sets the maximum 10 year authorization for CBD at US$ 28.4 million of which 9.8 million are core funds and 18.6 million are authorized for Bureau and Mission buy-ins. A.I.D. recently raised the core funds authorization to 20 million (Sohmer, pers. comm.).

A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the cooperative implementation of BSP as a joint venture was signed by WWF, IIED, and TNC on May 31, 1988, in advance of the signing of the PP and the CA.

The CBD is a ten year project, but a CA can have a maximum duration of only five years. Therefore the CBD has a Project Activity Completion Date (PACD) of 1998, but the CA creating BSP (No. DHR-5554-A-00-8044-00) was signed on Sept 30, 1988, giving the CA an expiration date of September 30 1993.

The CA states:

> "the goal of this project is to conserve biological diversity and to promote sustainable economic development in developing countries through better conservation and use of biological resources. The purpose is to improve the capacities of non-governmental and governmental institutions in A.I.D. partner countries and of A.I.D.-assisted programs to identify the critical needs for and economic potential of, conservation and wise management of biological resources, through safeguarding ecological processes, and maintaining the variety of genetic resources." [sic] (CA:1)

The CA establishes five components in the BSP: (1) technical assistance; (2) a small grants program for research; (3) training of staff of host-country organizations;

(4) an information collection/dissemination network; and (5) pilot demonstrations (this last component funded through buy-ins). (CA:2)

BSP is a creation of A.I.D. and the three signers of the MOU. It is housed within WWF and its staff are considered regular WWF employees. It is overseen by an Executive Committee that is composed of one Representative and one Alternate from each member of the Consortium (Although the MOU and the CA use the term "joint venture", the Evaluation Team has adopted the more commonly employed term "Consortium" to refer to the three participating PVOs.)

BSP began operations with the hiring of a Director and the first Program Officer in January 1989. The timing and the design of BSP appear to have been highly propitious, for the program has grown phenomenally. BSP has had one of the highest buy-in rates of any A.I.D. project. The staff has grown from two professionals plus an assistant to a current staff of seven senior staff, three research fellows/program assistants, and a small secretarial staff. BSP has conducted or supported activities in more than 60 countries.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The current evaluation of BSP is a mid-term evaluation as prescribed in the PP and CA. It is actually occurring at the end of the third year after the CA was signed and just over 2 1/2 years after the project became operational. The evaluation Scope of Work (SOW) is presented in Appendix A. The SOW states that the purpose:

> "is to review the progress made by BSP in implementing CBD, and assess the extent to which accomplishments to date will contribute to achievement of the project's objectives. The evaluation will ... if necessary, recommend modifications to strengthen future implementation."

The SOW for the evaluation is organized into the following general categories:

- Overall Implementation Progress and Effectiveness.
- Program Management
- Cross-Cutting Themes (as defined by S&T Guidance)
- Future BSP Implementation: Issues and Recommendations

This report is organized along these same lines.

Section 3.3.1 of A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook No. 7 presents an interesting perspective on mid-term evaluations. It recognizes that many issues often cannot be fully addressed or foreseen in the design stages of a project, and that "an interim evaluation would be a useful way to deal with these issues, in effect completing the initial project design." At a very early stage it became apparent to the Evaluation Team that there were no fundamental criticisms of BSP -- nearly everyone feels generally positive about the project. Therefore the Team determined that a key objective for this evaluation would be recommendations for improving the program and activities.

C. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation was conducted by a three-person team between September 4 and October 15, 1991. TvT Associates provided the two full-time team members, Roy Hagen (Team Leader) and John Shores (Natural Resources Specialist), under their Evaluation IQC PDC-0085-I-00-9087-00. The third team member was Dr. John Wilson, AID/LAC/DR/E Deputy Chief Environmental Officer. Dr. Wilson worked part-time on the evaluation starting September 24. He took responsibility for one portion of the evaluation, the input from the USAID Missions involved in BSP activities.

Office space with computer facilities was furnished to the Evaluation Team by WWF on the same floor as BSP. This proved to be logistically very convenient for the Team. BSP did an exceptional job in preparing thorough, well-organized briefing documents for the Team. The table of contents of the three volumes of the briefing book is included in Appendix G. Project files in the office of the S&T Project Manager were another source of information as were the numerous technical documents that resulted from BSP-funded activities. (See Appendix D).

The evaluation was conducted primarily through document review and interviews. Planning activities that took place during the initial week and a half of the evaluation included preparation of a list of people to interview, a working list of issues to be addressed, and an outline of the report. The list of relevant persons to interview as well as the initial list of issues were developed primarily from early, largely group meetings with S&T, BSP staff, and the Executive Committee and from the briefing documents. The report outline was subsequently used to assign principal analytic and drafting responsibilities among the Team members for chapters or sub-chapters of the report.

In order to analyze the mix of activities and components, Team member Shores developed a computerized data base of BSP activities. The data are preliminary in nature, but served to develop the matrices of expenditures and allocations in the report. The primary source for the data was the activities section of the briefing book (Volume 2). A summary list of these activities appears as Appendix F.

Nearly all Washington-area interviews were conducted jointly by Hagen and Shores. Appendix C, Part 1, contains the list of persons interviewed locally.

Mission input was obtained largely through telephone interviews conducted by John Wilson, assisted by Scott Lampman, Forestry Support Program (FSP) Coordinator for Latin America and the Caribbean. Input was solicited from the Mission in any country where involvement with BSP, through core funding and buy-ins, exceeded $20,000. A brief questionnaire was prepared and faxed to these 24 Missions a few days before the telephone interviews, to allow Mission staff to formulate their responses. Nineteen Missions were interviewed in this fashion, or responded by fax.

Appendix E contains a copy of this questionnaire and a synthesis prepared by John Wilson of the responses to each question. Wilson also prepared individual summaries of the lengthier responses from 15 of the Missions. The list of these countries is included in Appendix C, part 2. One response is from Africa, six from Asia, and eight from Latin America and the Caribbean. These are available in the files of the Project Manager and BSP. Individuals are encouraged to examine these summaries to see the broad divergence of opinions expressed.

Telephone interviews were used for Mission input for three reasons. First, it was felt that more Missions would respond to telephone contact than would have time to draft a written reply. Second, interviews were considered a better means of collecting the type of qualitative information the Team was seeking. Third, although international travel was contemplated in the SOW, it was not deemed an efficient use of consultants' time.

A preliminary draft of this report was completed and reviewed by the S&T Project Manager before his departure on leave on October 6. The full draft was distributed on October 7 to the Project Implementation Advisory Committee, the Executive Committee, and BSP. Individuals were asked to review the draft and submit comments and corrections to R&D/ENR by COB October 10. The final report was delivered to the PIAC during a briefing on October 15.

CHAPTER II: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EFFECTIVENESS

A. INTRODUCTION

The Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) is the popular name for a program created as a Cooperative Agreement between A.I.D. and WWF, under the broader Conservation of Biological Diversity Project (936-5554). A.I.D. approved the Cooperative Agreement with the understanding that WWF would act as the lead agency in a three-way joint venture with TNC and IIED (now the World Resources Institute or WRI -- see end notes). The members of the joint venture soon began using the term "consortium" instead of "joint venture." Members of the environment and development community in Washington began using "Biodiversity Support Program" or "BSP" for the cooperative project, instead of the more awkward "Cooperative Agreement component of the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project." In fact, BSP is but a portion of the full CBD project and the distinct name, although not official, helps identify the BSP project as a separate activity.

B. CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

The Biodiversity Support Program owes its origins to Amendments to the Foreign Assistance Act, particularly Section 118 of 1983 and Section 119 of 1986, concerning tropical deforestation and biological diversity, and to the subsequent Congressional earmarks for biodiversity, beginning in 1987. Section 119(b) of the FAA made possible the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project, the parent project of the BSP.

The S&T Bureau first used the Environmental Planning and Management (EPM) project to undertake some small biodiversity activities with 1987 earmarks, but support developed for a more institutionalized approach focusing specifically on biodiversity. This support culminated in the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project. Under CBD, S&T allocated funds for the National Science Foundation, the Consultative Group on Biological Diversity, and the Biodiversity Support Program.

From the grantee perspective, implementation of the BSP portion of CBD officially began with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), "for the Cooperative Implementation of the A.I.D. Biological Diversity Project" through which WWF, IIED, and TNC agree to "establish a joint venture ... for cooperative implementation of ... [CBD]." (MOU:1)

The Project Paper was formally approved on 9 June 1988, followed by the signing of the Cooperative Agreement between A.I.D. and WWF on 30 September 1988. From the A.I.D. perspective, the BSP portion officially began with the signing of the CA.

BSP staff commenced work in January of 1989. The design called for two professional positions and one-half of a support position. In July of 1989, the first of the increases in funding occurred, using the buy-in mechanism established in the PP and CA. Amendments to the Cooperative Agreement have increased funding by more than US$ 10 million over the period July '89 - August '91.

Figure II-1 presents a summary of significant events in the history of BSP. Several dates are particularly noteworthy. In April 1990, the BSP Director accepted the position of Vice President for Conservation Science in WWF. Although considerable effort was made to fill the BSP Director vacancy promptly, the position remained vacant for 16 months. Dr. Hartshorn endeavored to cover both full-time positions during those months, but many crucial decisions about program direction and strategy were postponed in deference to the pending appointment of a new Director.

The overall impression from the chronology of events is one of near meteoric growth and expansion. By the end of FY91, staff had grown from the original 2.5 positions to 12, funding had reached well over US$ 10 million, the number of activities had swelled to more than 120, and more than 60 countries had participated.

C. EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF CORE ACTIVITIES

The original PP and CA were elegantly vague in describing the specific activities and levels of effort for each component. The designers of the PP stated that this was a deliberate decision to enable BSP to adapt rapidly to targets of opportunity. The designers recognized that "[c]onservation of biological resources may seldom occupy a central position in A.I.D.'s country programming of economic development assistance." (CA:19) Therefore BSP was designed to be flexible and provide carefully focused assistance to interested Missions.

The PP and CA establish for the project a broad framework consisting of a "careful mix" (PP:2) of four core components plus buy-ins (called "pilot demonstrations" in the PP and CA). The allocation of funds or level of effort among components or across regions was not specified in the PP or CA; only illustrative budgets are provided. Figure II-2 presents the cumulative allocations for field activities (not including salaries, benefits, and overhead). Appendix F presents a listing of these BSP-related activities in more detail.

Africa received the majority of the technical assistance (TA), Latin America the majority of research (RE) and training (TR), and the rest of the funds and activities were fairly evenly distributed among regions.

Figure II-1: Events in BSP History

1988	
31 May	Memorandum of Understanding signed, through which "WWF, IIED, and TNC establish a joint venture."
09 Jun	Conservation of Biological Diversity Project Paper signed. Acting S&T Project Manager assigned.
30 Sep	A.I.D. - WWF Cooperative Agreement signed.
Dec	Executive Committee begins regular monthly meetings.
1989	
Jan	First BSP Director hired
Jan	First Program Officer hired
10 Jul	Amendment 1: US$ 380,042
29 Aug	Amendment 2: US$ 1,539,386
1990	
Apr	BSP Director named WWF/Vice President for Conservation Science, continues as BSP Director.
May	Program Officer for Africa hired
Jun	Program Officer for Latin America hired
25 Jun	Amendment 3: US$ 2,118,000
28 Aug	Amendment 4: US$ 920,000
29 Sep	Amendment 5: US$ 135,863
Oct	S&T Project Manager hired
1991	
Jan	Program Officer for Asia hired
Apr	Program Officer for Climate Change hired
05 Apr	Amendment 6: US$ 1,300,000
10 May	Amendment 7: US$ (300,000) deobligated
08 Aug	Amendment 8: US$ 1,703,615
19 Aug	New BSP Director hired
21 Aug	Amendment 9: US$ 1,385,852
31 Aug	Amendment 10: US$ 1,446,200
04 Sep	Mid-term Evaluation begun
15 Oct	Mid-term Evaluation completed

Figure II-2: Approximate Allocations for Field Activities
(Amounts in US$ 000's)
(Cumulative obligations -- through FY91)

A.I.D. Regional Areas

BSP Project Components	Africa	Asia	Latin Amer.	Europe N.East	Global	Sub-total
Technical	138	61	5	0	0	203
Assistance	90	0	0	0	0	90
Research	137	96	365	15	0	614
Grants	0	0	0	0		0
Training	0	72	144	0	25	241
	0	0	0	0	0	0
Information	34	31	22	0	292	378
Networking	0	0	12	0	0	12
Pilot	0	0	0	0	0	0
Demonstration	1,640	1,746	2,233	800	98	6,517
Special	0	0	0	0	0	0
Projects	250	50	0	0	0	300
Regional	309	259	536	15	317	1,436
Sub-totals	1,980	1,797	2,245	800	98	6,920

Notes:

1. Official names of A.I.D. regions have been shortened to save space.
2. Entries represent field activities only; no salaries, benefits, office expenses, or overhead included.
3. Upper numbers in a box represent core funds, lower numbers represent buy-in funds.
4. "Special Projects" are A.I.D.-funded activities operated through BSP but not using the regular buy-in mechanism. (see end notes)
5. Totals may vary slightly due to rounding.

Europe is a new area for A.I.D. assistance and is therefore one of the newest buy-ins to BSP. The vast majority of the sub-total for Africa is also a recent buy-in, with many of the anticipated activities still in the planning and initiation phases.

1. Technical Assistance The directive of the PP and CA was that TA would be offered "to Missions, host-country institutions including indigenous NGOs and PVOs, and the Peace Corps" with an illustrative list of more than two dozen categories for TA. (PP:24, CA:8) In practice, most of the TA was directed at feasibility studies and background studies of options for biodiversity conservation. These led to proposals exceeding US$ 5 million to A.I.D. and other donors, including a buy-in from Thailand for nearly US$ 500,000 and a "quasi buy-in" [see chapter end notes for explanation of these terms] from The Gambia for US$ 250,000. A conservation needs assessment planned for Papua New Guinea recently received Mission clearance. One of its anticipated products is a major proposal to the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

Missions cited the ability of BSP to deliver high quality TA promptly as one of the most positive aspects of the program. The flexibility to respond to Missions' needs and the field-oriented perspective were also cited as positive aspects of the TA.

Missions generally felt that TA was provided in a timely and cost-effective manner. A significant number of Missions expressed support for increasing the core budget to enable BSP to provide greater amounts of TA. The only negative comments about TA were in regard to information flowing back to the Missions. In a majority of the cases where BSP provided TA, Missions felt that reports had not arrived at the Missions in a timely fashion. From the perspective of the A.I.D. Contracts Officer, BSP's only contractual obligation is to report to S&T. However, technical reporting is definitely a professional courtesy the Missions expect.

The TA efforts have been high-leverage activities and can have considerable carry-over effects. They can, and do, leverage other donor funds to support biodiversity conservation activities (Jim Osborne, A.I.D./South Pacific). Providing technical and programmatic input into proposals has been a highly successful aspect of the TA under BSP.

Another particularly encouraging activity is a review, now underway, of the Africa Bureau's biodiversity strategy and portfolio. This provides an important mechanism for infusing biodiversity concerns into A.I.D. internal programming and strategies. It also complements, in the case of Africa, additional funds that are being programmed under a Regional Bureau buy-in to BSP.

Two of the 15 activities under this component are perhaps misclassified. The Lake Tanganyika Conference might be a better example of networking than technical assistance. The travel for Dipterocarp studies might be classified as a research effort.

2. Research The research component is a highly targeted small grants program for host-country principal investigators. The grants are for a (nominal) maximum of US$ 15,000 up to 24 months. The original purpose of the research component was "to fund studies addressing specific issues generally relevant to A.I.D.'s conservation activities worldwide." (CA:12) Although the awards vary in amount, the average funding per activity was US$ 13,600.

The philosophy behind the small research grants program recognizes that deserving LDC researchers receive less than their appropriate share of funds. This occurs in part because they do not have access to some funds, do not know about others, or their proposal formulations are weak. Strengthening the researchers' abilities to identify sources and submit strong proposals will aid science directly and indirectly. The small grants program is therefore envisioned by BSP as a human resource development program as well.

Categorizing the research projects is difficult in the absence of final reports, but Figure II-3 presents a rough attempt by the Evaluation Team to classify the subjects and types of research.

Figure II-3: Categorization of Research Grants

Percent	Category or primary focus
30 %	Parks and protected areas
25 %	Ecological relationships
15 %	Ethnological-biological relationships
15 %	Biological inventories
10 %	Sustainable production/integrated conservation and development projects
10 %	Individual species
10 %	Economic studies
7 %	Restoration studies

Note: Each grant may have more than one component. Individual percents sum to more than 100% because of these multiple listings. N=44 awards.

It is unclear if the actual distribution of research grants represents a priority ranking of the suggested research topics. The RFP establishes categories and themes for proposals, but does not indicate any weightings among categories, nor do the PP and CA. The PP and CA suggest that the Agency Biological Diversity Working Group establish and review priorities for research. This group is now essentially incorporated into the CBD Project Implementation Advisory Committee (PIAC),

established in late 1990 shortly after the arrival of the full-time S&T Project Manager. The PIAC is mandated in the PP but was not created until nearly two years into the project. The research component does not have an explicit system of ranking proposals by category.

The current and near-final draft of the Global Biodiversity Strategy (WRI-IUCN-UNEP) emphasizes in situ conservation of biodiversity, but states that experiments in sustainable production (e.g., natural forest management) and ecological restoration are also high priorities. This kind of broad priority setting needs to be incorporated into the BSP research component.

The Evaluation Team defers any assessment of the results of the research component until the research has been completed. Awards were only begun in April of 1991. Most run for 12 - 24 months. A closer look at the results of the research activities will have to wait for a later evaluation.

With regard to the directive to the mid-term evaluators to give special attention "to whether more core funding from S&T/FENR should be allocated to research" (PP:40, CA:21), the Evaluation Team finds no strong basis to recommend an increase at this time in the core funds for the small grants research program. The Team notes that the research component already receives the largest portion of BSP core funds (see Figure V-1).

A case was made in support of the small research grants program as a vital first step for many LDC researchers. According to supporters, there are few, if any, other sources of funds for first-time academics and researchers. The BSP research grants program is too recent to assess if the small grants serve as bridges to larger funding in the future. Some Regional Bureau staff argued that the research component is just as valid today as it was three years ago, while one or two others stated that the small grants program as now embodied lacked any focus and should be eliminated. Missions tended not to be informed about research grants awarded to principal investigators in their countries. The Missions benefit more directly (at least in the short-term) from other core-funded components: technical assistance, training, and information. The Evaluation Team feels that the research grants experiment is worth continuing, but deserves careful scrutiny when more results are available during a later evaluation.

3. Training The training component is described as focusing "on building the capacity of host-country scientists and institutions to structure research and development programs." The objective is to improve the quality of proposals and assist in identifying sources of funding (PP:32, CA:15).

In practice, the single largest activity was funding for the second year of a parataxonomists course in Costa Rica. The majority of funding in this component has

gone to training in institutional development, particularly for NGO staff. Two other activities (Smithsonian training course and the advanced training in Ecuador: see Appendix F) appear from review of the documentation to be strictly academic/field biology rather than tied to research and development programs per se. The average cost per activity was roughly US$ 20,000.

Training activities have generally received high marks from the individuals involved. Participants have found the leadership and proposal design workshops very useful. Quality has been high, workshops have been professional and timely, and overall they have been cost-effective with regard to their individual goals and objectives. There has not, however, been a particular focus on the stated goals of the component as expressed in the original BSP documents.

The Evaluation Team finds that the training component has lacked focus and a clear strategy. The project documents suggest that the original intent was to increase the fundraising capabilities of host-country institutions. The parataxonomists course increased field and laboratory capabilities, but not fundraising. This is not a criticism of a very valuable course, but a highlighting of a divergence from original design.

The training component would benefit from a clear strategy and action plan. Particularly important is expansion of publication efforts to increase the number of individuals and institutions reached. Training events should become laboratories for refining and adapting materials and styles of presentation that can be widely disseminated through the publications/outreach efforts.

At least a portion of the training program should continue to focus on improving institutional capabilities to plan, fund, and implement projects successfully. A parallel effort should continue to seek innovative, high-leverage activities (such as funding a parataxonomists course in its first year). Missions felt that BSP should also give attention to expanding the training activities to reach regions and countries that did not benefit from the earlier training events.

The Evaluation Team recommends no change in core funding for the training component.

4. Information and Evaluation Network The information and evaluation network component is intended to "provide the Agency with an overview of its biological diversity program" and guide the development of all of the other components, including the pilot demonstrations (PP:32, CA:16).

The activities under this component have focused on supporting conferences, conference proceedings, newsletters, and research publications. The largest segment of funding, on the other hand, (US$ 175,000 or more than 46%) has gone to

supporting three iterations of the WRI study tracking biodiversity spending. Another US$ 49,754 (13%) has been allocated for a study of methods used to establish geographical priorities for the conservation of biodiversity within a given country. Together these represent nearly 60% of the expenditures for this component, without getting to the kernel of the biodiversity challenge which is tackling the "how to" question. See Chapter V.A.3 for further discussion of the relative importance of the questions, "what areas to conserve?" and "how to conserve them?"

To date, it appears that the information component has not been used fully for its stated purpose. The largest single activity of the information collection effort has been limited to tracking expenditures on biodiversity. Little or no effort has gone into prescribing or even identifying appropriate programs and initiatives on a global, regional, or country basis. Little or no formal effort has gone into determining directions for the other components of BSP. In particular, the pilot demonstrations component does not appear to have benefited from the evaluation and monitoring component in an explicit way. This represents a missed opportunity, given the considerable size of the buy-ins.

The Evaluation Team finds that the information and evaluation network component is an essential part of the program, but has not been used to its fullest potential. Activities should be chosen on the basis of their expected multiplier effects. Case studies, manuals, and conference-related activities are typically high-leverage events. Activities that lead to priority setting for other components of BSP and activities that contribute to closer collaboration with A.I.D. in the design and implementation of buy-ins would also be candidates.

The Evaluation Team did not find compelling evidence of the impact of the investment tracking study. As an experimental undertaking it was arguably an appropriate activity, but it is now in its third iteration. BSP should not be using its scarce resources to continue asking "How much is being spent?" but the more targeted question, "Where and on what should more effort be focused?"

The absence of an explicit BSP strategy for the Information and Evaluation Network component makes it difficult to ensure that activities under the component contribute effectively to overall BSP goals and objectives. The Evaluation Team agrees with the original project documents that direct the Information and Evaluation Network component "to form the underpinning for the [other] components" (PP:32).

The Team disagrees with the interpretation that original project documents direct the continued funding of studies that track expenditures. The wording in the PP and CA directs BSP to track "conservation activities." Nothing is said about expenditures. The emphasis should be on answering the questions related to <u>how</u> to conserve biodiversity. The information and evaluation component should focus on

identifying success stories, disseminating lessons learned, and monitoring projects that are innovative and promising.

This re-focused and expanded effort would go beyond the current staffing level of the BSP. The Evaluation Team recommends an increase in core funding for the information and evaluation network component. The increase should be based on a comprehensive strategy for this component, but should include at least an equivalent full-time senior staff position for information, monitoring, evaluation, networking, and outreach.

D. EFFECTIVENESS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF BUY-INS

As intended in the PP and CA, buy-ins have become the largest single source of funds for the BSP. Regional Bureaus and Missions expressed nearly unanimous satisfaction with the effectiveness, timeliness, and quality of the activities undertaken with buy-ins. It should be noted that most of the activities under buy-ins are very recent, so the assessment is based on the preparatory activities, not end-of-activity results. Nevertheless, this speaks highly of the professional and technical skills of the BSP staff in working with Missions and Bureaus to design the buy-ins.

The Evaluation Team finds that the process of buy-ins was quite satisfactory to the Regional Bureaus and Missions involved. The Team defers an assessment of any results until a later evaluation, owing to the recentness of the implementation of activities. In the case of the recent Africa Region buy-in, for example, the US$ 800,000 of pilot demonstration activities has not yet been programmed.

BSP staff invest considerable effort in the negotiation and design of buy-ins. Most of this effort occurs well ahead of any formal agreement and is therefore not chargeable against the buy-ins' staff time allocation. In effect, the time BSP invests must be charged to core funds.

E. ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT DESIGN

The original project design was intentionally vague. This was intended to give BSP maximum flexibility. It has certainly achieved that intention, but it has made it particularly difficult to detect significant results that are attributable to BSP activities. In practice, the original design allowed BSP to become a very responsive entity.

According to Ed Thomas (AID/W Grant Officer), a Cooperative Agreement is a mechanism for A.I.D. to support or intensify a program of the grantee. A unique aspect of BSP is that there was no specific program known as BSP prior to the MOU and CA, just a preponderant capability among the three Consortium members.

Relying on buy-ins for expansion of its activities, BSP has essentially accepted all offers of buy-ins. Only where contractual or legal restrictions inhibited work did Regional Bureau or Mission expressions of interest not lead to a buy-in. This is commendable in that it allowed BSP to use its capabilities to encourage Agency efforts in biodiversity.

While it is important to be able to respond in positive ways to significant expressions of interest from Regional Bureaus and Missions, it is also important to develop and maintain a clear vision of where the program is going and how it will achieve its goal. The project designers felt that the project documents had to be vague because nobody could predict how quickly nor how substantively A.I.D. would respond to Congressional mandates for biodiversity activities. Vagueness was a way to avoid tying the hands of the project to a particular design or model. There was an expectation that the expertise of the three Consortium members would contribute to defining the priorities for BSP. Hands were not tied, but at the same time, new directions were not fashioned. BSP was kept so busy responding to Bureau and Mission agendas that it did not have a chance to focus its resources on advancing the science and techniques of biodiversity conservation.

Now, after three years of experience with the program, it is an appropriate time to take stock of what the specific contribution of BSP can be. Given recent advances in biodiversity knowledge and current Agency programs and strategies, the time is ripe to develop a BSP strategy that includes specific initiatives in key areas. As BSP moves from a reactive phase to a more strategically proactive phase, such a plan would help define and explain the program to potential clients and audiences. The Evaluation Team strongly encourages the development of a strategic plan; with the assumption that a strategic plan will be developed, the Team finds does not recommend any redesign of the program itself.

F. ROLES OF CONSORTIUM MEMBERS

The Memorandum of Understanding, which preceded the PP and the CA, establishes the roles of the members of the joint venture. In addition to resolving "substantive questions and issues that relate to the Project ..." (MOU:2) and holding regular monthly meetings, the members pledge "access to the large core of professional talent represented at WWF, [WRI], and TNC (and their associated organizations)." (MOU:3) Close collaboration with WWF has been evident. WRI has participated in at least five substantive activities. The record suggests that, with one or two exceptions such as consultation on activities in Mexico, TNC has not had a very consultative or substantive role. It was, however, part of the basis for justifying the non-competitive award of the Cooperative Agreement to WWF and the Consortium in the first place. The three members of the Consortium were recognized in the PP as:

"together ... represent[ing] a preponderant capability of U.S. conservation organizations working globally with indigenous non-governmental organizations and governments in developing countries on programs that link conservation and development." (PP:10)

The Executive Committee and BSP should increase their efforts to draw together the cooperating institutions and share their developing technical and geographic expertise.

WWF, TNC, and WRI also agreed that:

"[t]he cooperating institutions agree to give full acknowledgment of the joint nature of the Project in their publications, publicity releases, and reports resulting from implementation of the project." (MOU:3)

The record on acknowledgements has been mixed. A review of the BSP-supported reports and publications showed that slightly more than one-half of them acknowledged BSP support. Almost as many were presented as if the activity were solely a WWF undertaking. This issue was raised several times by Executive Committee members in the first two years of the project. Furthermore, A.I.D. staff expressed their concern that acknowledgement of A.I.D. support had been problematic.

Some activities, such as the Seminar Series, eventually changed the wording of their advertising to reflect BSP's joint-venture ownership. Others, even reports published in 1991, failed to acknowledge BSP support. At least one report from 1991 has the WWF logo on every page of the publication, but made no mention of BSP or A.I.D. A pressure-sensitive label was added post-publication to acknowledge BSP's contribution to financing the report with A.I.D. funds. One or two A.I.D. staff mentioned that they were disappointed that A.I.D. was not credited more often as the sole supporter of BSP.

BSP staff asserted that they have endeavored to have recipients acknowledge BSP and Consortium support in publications, posters, and reports. Nevertheless, it is somewhat odd that WWF receives acknowledgement yet BSP and the Consortium do not. Some of this may be explained because WWF is the lead agency and the check-writer for BSP, yet the result is a continuing irritation to the other Consortium members and A.I.D. The Evaluation Team finds little justification for allowing this to continue.

G. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER INSTITUTIONS

One of the directives from the PP and CA is for BSP to reach out to the wider community. The CA states:

> "The project will seek assistance from and cooperation with numerous other U.S. organizations involved in international conservation work ... PVOs, Government Agencies, Private foundations, Academic institutions, Zoos, Botanical gardens, and Museums." (CA:3)

In practice, the BSP has involved an impressive number of organizations from the United States and abroad. Figure II-4 presents a summary of the level of collaborative activity with Consortium members and non-members. Figure II-5 lists the principal institutions by category.

Although WWF-US was the largest single collaborator with BSP, WWF is also the Consortium member with the largest and most globally oriented program. In looking for cooperators on a project or activity, BSP is more likely to find an appropriate collaborator in WWF than any other single entity. WWF also had the lowest cost/activity load on core funds and made the greatest use (absolute and relative) of buy-in funds. WRI, given its different nature (not a member-supported grant-making institution), had the highest cost/activity load on core funds and the lowest ratio (2.5) of buy-ins/core funds. TNC, and the collaborators in the other 112 activities not involving a Consortium member, fell somewhere in between.

Several interesting findings are apparent in the Figure II-4. The vast majority (more than 70%) of BSP core funds, over which BSP and the Executive Committee exercise the most control, went to non-Consortium collaborators. Where Consortium members did collaborate on BSP activities, the vast majority of the funds came from buy-ins (over which BSP exercises less control).

Figure II-4: Collaborating Institutions and Funds

Institutions	#	Core $	Buy-in $
World Wildlife Fund - US	32	160,376	3,512,932
World Resources Institute	10	229,754	566,792
The Nature Conservancy	4	25,000	215,000
Non-Consortium	112	1,021,199	2,754,968
All Activities	156	1,436,329	6,920,292

Note: "#" refers to the number of separate activities involving the institution(s). The final line is not an exact summation of the upper figures because there were two activities involving more than one Consortium member; one linking WWF + WRI and one linking WWF + TNC.

Figure II-5: Collaborators in BSP Activities

Consortium Members
The Nature Conservancy
World Resources Institute
World Wildlife Fund - US

PVO's and NGO's
Association for Tropical Biology
Atlantic Center for the Environment
Belize Center for Environmental Studies
Center for Marine Conservation
Cultural Survival
ECOSFERA AC (Mexico)
Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific
Green Peace
Institute of Conservation and Culture
Institute of World Affairs
Institute of Current World Affairs
Institute for Conservation Leadership
Instituto de Historia Natural (Mexico)
Instituto de Biodiversidad (Costa Rica)
International Council for Bird Preservation
International Center for Research on Women

International Union for Conservation of Nature
Nehru Foundation for Conservation and Development
Organization of Tropical Studies
ProNatura (Mexico)
Wildlife Institute of India
Wildlife Conservation International
Woods Hole Research Center
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute
WWF/Tanzania
WWF/UK

Government and Multilateral Agencies
AID/Bureaus and Missions
Goddard Space Flight Center
Royal Forest Department (Thailand)
Smithsonian Institution
South Pacific Regional Environmental Programme
UNEP
US National Park Service
US Forest Service
US Geological Survey
World Bank

Private Foundations
Consultative Group on Biological Diversity
King Mahendra Trust for Nature Conservation
International Fund for Agricultural Research

Academic Institutions
Duke University
Harvard University
University of California/Davis
University of Illinois
University of Maryland
University of Arizona

Zoos, Gardens, and Museums
Bishop Museum
Botanical Society of Chile
Goeldi Museum (Brazil)
Missouri Botanical Garden
New York Botanical Garden
Zoological Parks Association (Thailand)

Private Sector
Development Alternatives, Inc
Maderas del Pueblo (Mexico)
Management Development, Inc.

The staff of BSP has done an admirable job of reaching out to the broader conservation community for cooperation and assistance. These figures represent the official relationships only and do not reflect the numerous instances where BSP staff consult and are consulted by their counterparts in other institutions.

H. A.I.D. RANKINGS OF S&T PROJECTS

Late in FY91, S&T circulated a questionnaire to Regional Bureaus with a request that they review the S&T portfolio for field support. BSP's parent project, CBD, received the highest rank of all S&T/FENR projects. This is the same rank it received in FY90. Although BSP is only a part of the CBD project, it is the largest component and likely to comprise the activities most Bureaus and Missions identify as CBD.

End Notes to Chapter II

1. The International Institute for Environment and Development - North America (IIED-NA) was one of the original members of the BSP Consortium. At the time the Consortium was formed, IIED-NA was in the process of separating from its sister organization, IIED-United Kingdom (IIED-UK). The operations of IIED-NA passed to the World Resources Institute (WRI), essentially embodied in the Center for International Development and Environment (WRI/CIDE).

2. Buy-ins for the BSP are Amendments to the Cooperative Agreement that authorize the transfer of funds from a Regional Bureau or Mission project to S&T in support of the purpose of the existing Cooperative Agreement.

3. In the case of The Gambia's "quasi buy-in" mechanism, the Mission approved an unsolicited proposal from BSP to USAID/The Gambia for a grant to fund activities. The grant mechanism was used because USAID/The Gambia was eager to fund the activities but had no other appropriate project in the A.I.D. portfolio as the source of the funds. The result is viewed as a buy-in, although it is contractually a PVO grant. This is evidence of the flexibility the BSP provides to work with Missions and Bureaus for purposes of mutual interest.

CHAPTER III: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

A. MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW

BSP was created through a Memorandum of Understanding between WWF, IIED (now WRI), and TNC followed by a Cooperative Agreement between WWF and AID/S&T. No contradictions were noted between these two documents. The CA calls for the "substantial involvement" of A.I.D. in the project. The S&T Project Manager has principal responsibility for S&T's management and involvement in the project, assisted and advised by the PIAC. All buy-ins to the project from Bureaus and Missions require an Amendment to the CA. Amendments are executed by the S&T Grants Officer.

On the grantee side, management authority for BSP is found at two levels -- the Executive Committee and the BSP Director. The Executive Committee is composed of one representative from each of the Consortium members (in practice, both the Representative and the Alternate are invited to all meetings) and has decision-making authority on substantive and policy issues that relate to BSP's :

- implementation,
- administration and staffing,
- budgetary matters, and
- strategies and policies.

This is to be done during regular monthly meetings.

> "Day-to-day operation of the project will be the responsibility of the Project Director and ... staff." (PP:21)

As the "lead organization" of the Consortium and the signatory to the CA, WWF is the recipient of, and is accountable for, all A.I.D. funds for BSP. WWF is responsible for the financial and technical reporting to A.I.D.

B. S&T/FENR MANAGEMENT

1. Project Manager The S&T Project Manager for the CBD Project has principal management authority for the BSP Project, including A.I.D.'s "substantial involvement" in the Cooperative Agreement. The CA specifies that the nature and extent of this substantial involvement is:

- Approval of the hiring of the BSP Director;
- Concurrence in selection of other full-time BSP staff and short-term advisors;
- Approval of annual work plans and budgets. This includes oversight on allocation of core funds among regions and adherence to matching the annual funds available to the assistance requested;
- Annual management reviews with senior WWF staff;
- Field visits as feasible;
- Liaison between BSP and S&T, the Regional Bureaus, and Missions; and
- Project Manager's concurrence through sign-off on all PIO/Ts to assure they conform to the project purposes and the availability of grantee staff resources to provide the assistance requested. (CA:19)

Nothing in the above list suggests a close day-to-day supervision. The items are either activities that occur at widely spaced intervals or are very general in scope.

There have been two S&T Project Managers to date. Molly Kux took the lead for S&T in designing the project, but moved to ANE before CBD became operational. Dan Deely was the first (Acting) Project Manager from January 1989 until October 1990 when he was replaced by Dr. Seymour (Sy) Sohmer. The two have very different management styles and approaches.

While serving as Acting Project Manager, Deely took a light-handed management approach. However, his long experience with S&T and his particular expertise in the A.I.D. budgeting process made him very effective in defending BSP's interests at this level.

Sohmer joined S&T in October 1990 with strong credentials but without A.I.D. management experience. He has had much closer involvement with BSP than his predecessor. CBD is the only project he manages. The extended search for a new BSP Director was underway during nearly all of his tenure.

With the recent appointment of a new BSP Director, this would seem to be an excellent time to define what the working relationship between the A.I.D. Project Manager and the BSP Director should be. Furthermore, the PM specifically asked the Evaluation Team to help define what "substantial involvement" should mean in the case of BSP.

The A.I.D. Handbook 13 Chapter 6 on Cooperative Agreements cites the Office of Management and Budget policy on substantial involvement:

> "Agencies should limit Federal involvement in assisted activities to the minimum consistent with program requirements." (HB13:6-4)

A Cooperative Agreement is primarily intended as a mechanism for A.I.D. to provide assistance to a grantee to expand an ongoing program or to undertake activities they would like to undertake if they had the resources.

With this background, we feel that the A.I.D. Project Manager's role should be characterized as follows:

- The relationship between the S&T Project Manager and the BSP staff should be one of collegial collaboration between professionals.

- The Project Manager should ensure that BSP activities conform to the guidelines of the CA but should clearly not be involved in the day-to-day details of project management. The Project Manager's principal concerns should be on the overall effectiveness of the program in addressing the major issues and problems confronting the conservation of biodiversity in A.I.D.-assisted countries. This would facilitate BSP support for ensuring the effectiveness of the A.I.D. biodiversity portfolio.

- The Project Manager should be the spokesperson and the advocate for BSP within S&T and with the Regional Bureaus and the Missions. To do this, the Project Manager must be kept well informed at all times on the status of BSP's portfolio of activities. This will require regular communication with the BSP Director and adequate reporting from BSP.

- The Project Manager should be continually on the alert for opportunities for collaboration with the Regional Bureaus and Missions, should identify and assess any sources of dissatisfaction, should seek to define issues and trends in biodiversity within A.I.D., and share this information with the BSP staff. This should include communicating to BSP staff all relevant items from A.I.D. cable traffic, memorandums, notices of upcoming meetings, etc.

- The Project Manager should provide BSP with advice helpful to them in their strategic planning, but should not dictate in any way BSP's priorities.

- The Project Manager should be highly conversant with A.I.D. regulations, contracting procedures, sources of potential funding, and especially with the budgeting process as they affect BSP, and should use this knowledge to defend the program's best interests.

Beyond the relationship with BSP, the Project Manager for the Conservation of Biodiversity Project is ideally situated to be a principal biodiversity advisor for all of A.I.D. and the link between BSP and the remainder of the Agency's biodiversity activities.

2. Project Implementation Advisory Committee The Cooperative Agreement calls for the creation of a Project Implementation Advisory Committee (PIAC) in AID/W with the grantee implementors. Although the wording in the CA is not completely clear, it seems that the following functions for the PIAC were foreseen:

- Help ensure that proposed project interventions fit within the context of the overall aims of A.I.D. within a given country.

- Ensure that demand for services is matched with the real needs in different countries.

- Review annual work plans and deliberate periodically on services delivery, project magnitude, cooperation, and strategic interests.

The PIAC was not formed until December 1990 in response to Sohmer's initiative. Its membership varies, but is composed of about seven of the key individuals in the different A.I.D. Bureaus and Offices who are directly concerned with biodiversity. Four meetings of the PIAC have been held. Attendance has never exceeded 50%. The Evaluation SOW and the small research grants RFP's have been the principal topics discussed.

Although the formal meetings of the PIAC appear to have been of variable utility, its members include many of the people within A.I.D. with whom it is important for the CBD Project Manager to liaise. The relative importance of formal meetings versus memoranda, personal meetings, and telephone contacts is a judgement call for the PM and should depend on the situation.

C. THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

BSP is a new entity created in 1988 by the Consortium using A.I.D. funding and under the policy and decision-making authority of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee was formed as planned and has met nearly every month since its first meeting in December 1988. Most meetings are attended by both the Principal and the Alternate representative from each Consortium member as well as

the full professional staff of BSP. The Chair rotates annually among WWF, WRI, and TNC. The agenda for each meeting is drafted by BSP and then presented to the Chair for review and modifications. There has been little turnover in the Committee membership, and this has provided good continuity. All the current members are male.

A review of the minutes of the Committee meetings indicates a largely collegial atmosphere. Agendas have consisted primarily of presentations by the BSP Director and program staff of current and up-coming BSP activities followed by discussion. The BSP staff and the implementation of project activities have clearly benefitted from the collective wisdom and experience of the Executive Committee.

There is little evidence, however, that the basic content and direction of the Biodiversity Support Program has been strongly influenced by the Executive Committee. All of the principal core-funded components of the project (technical assistance, research, training, and information and evaluation networking) are very general topic areas. One would have expected the Executive Committee to provide strategic guidance for each of these components to define the priorities on which BSP could focus in order to achieve the greatest impact.

No strategic plan has been developed for the BSP. The lack of one causes both the BSP staff and the Executive Committee to be much more reactive than they need to be. The BSP staff does negotiate the content of buy-ins as requests come in from Bureaus and the Missions, but this is done without any formal strategy or written criteria. BSP then presents these recommendations to the Executive Committee. Quality work is performed, and none of activities is contrary to the philosophies of the Consortium members. But the lack of an explicit strategy implies that all activities are of equal importance -- that there are no priorities. The Evaluation Team believes that there should be strategic priorities, and that they should be explicit.

The need for a strategic focus is mentioned from time to time in the Executive Committee minutes. One of the reasons given for not addressing this issue was the extended search for a new BSP Director. The Executive Committee and WWF made their selection criteria very restrictive and were unable to find a candidate acceptable to them for a 1½ year period. Strategic planning was postponed so that the new Director could be closely involved.

D. BIODIVERSITY SUPPORT PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Day-to-day operation of the project is the responsibility of the BSP Director and staff. Although Hartshorn filled this position from January 1989 to August 1991, beginning in April 1990 he also held a second full-time position, that of WWF Vice President for Conservation Science. As a WWF employee, the BSP Director reports

to the WWF Vice President for Conservation Science; these two positions are therefore closely related, but the combined workload entailed 70-80 hour weeks (Hartshorn, pers. comm.). Hartshorn was finally able to step aside in August 1991 when Dr. Kathy Saterson was hired as BSP Director.

It is generally recognized that the BSP Director has done a superb job of recruiting a highly motivated, well-qualified staff of professionals with a well-balanced mix of academic and development skills and experience. Two of the Program Officers are former AAAS Fellows with A.I.D. and a third worked overseas as an A.I.D. contractor.

Mission input to the Evaluation was particularly helpful in evaluating the quality of BSP management. See Appendix E for the questionnaire and a summary of Mission responses to each question. Questionnaires were sent out by fax to 24 Missions and responses were obtained by telephone interview or fax from nineteen.

Most respondents felt that BSP assistance and activities were conducted in a timely, efficient, and cost-effective manner. Missions familiar with the details of BSP activities in their countries are pleased with the program. Missions remarked on the high quality of the BSP professional staff; their sensitivity to the local needs of Missions, host-country governments and non-government institutions; and their collaborative manner. Many Missions rated the TA provided by BSP as excellent. Another positive aspect was the availability of additional funds to support Mission programs.

The TA provided by BSP has been recruited without maintaining any formal roster or systematic files on available talent. Individuals are typically located by networking within the BSP staff, the Consortium members and the broader environmental PVO community. That this appears to have worked so well testifies to one of the real strengths of the Consortium. The FSP roster, which focuses on forestry, has been used on occasion, but has not been very useful in locating the types of skills required by BSP.

On the negative side, the most chronic problem frequently cited by Missions is the failure of BSP to keep them informed or to provide adequate financial and technical reporting, especially the latter. BSP has not provided regular reports to Missions on the implementation of their in-country activities, even in cases when such reports have been requested. This has limited the effectiveness of information exchange and coordination of natural resource management activities by Missions.

Missions are generally not concerned with the financial accounting for BSP's use of core funds, but several Missions have requested an accounting for expenditures of funds provided through Mission buy-ins. Rough estimates have been provided, but none of Missions reported receiving full, current accounting of expenditures. One

Mission reported that the financial accounting weakness has made them wary of committing further funds to BSP.

It must be pointed out that BSP has no contractual obligation to provide any direct financial or technical reporting to Missions or Bureaus. BSP is only required to report to the S&T Project Manager on the use of core funds and buy-ins. The Thailand Mission included financial and technical reporting requirements in the PIO/T for the very first buy-in to BSP. The S&T Grants Office removed these requirements from the formal Amendment to the Cooperative Agreement, but did not inform the Thai Mission of what they had done. The PM did not send a copy of the (now altered) Amendment to the Mission, a step that could have avoided further misunderstandings.

There is also a technical problem for financial reporting. BSP does not have its own financial accounting system; this is a service provided by WWF. Each buy-in is generally assigned its own "cost center." For accounting purposes, all the different activities included within a buy-in are lumped together. Separate accounting by activity within a buy-in is not routinely done. To do so upon special request is very laborious because, under the present system, it must be done by hand.

BSP and WWF are working together to revise WWF's accounting system to provide routine accounting by activity. When this becomes fully operational, quarterly financial reports (with about a one-month lag time) should be possible. The new system will also give BSP the capability of responding punctually at any time to specific requests for a financial accounting on a given buy-in. This is, of course, a major undertaking, and will take quite some time to accomplish. BSP may have to take other measures in the meantime to provide better interim financial reporting.

Recommendations on reporting are included in Chapter V.

Several of the individuals interviewed in the Missions reported they were unaware of some of the core-funded activities conducted in their host country. One Mission reported the arrival of BSP staff without the Mission being informed. (BSP staff dispute this, asserting they have cables and faxes to show prior clearance.) In any case, these are very sensitive issues and BSP management should be careful to ensure that each Mission is kept well informed of all BSP activities in the country. Every opportunity should be taken to coordinate BSP activities with the Missions.

CHAPTER IV: CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

A. INTRODUCTION

The Bureau for Science and Technology issued a special Yellow-Top Guidance on Administrative Procedures for Conducting Evaluations (Program Guidance 91-06 January 1991) with an attachment entitled "S&T Cross-Cutting Evaluation Themes." The attachment describes six cross-cutting themes that are of particular importance to S&T projects: cost-sharing, buy-ins, sustainability, women in development, peer review, and information collection. Each of these themes is treated separately below.

The Project Paper and Cooperative Agreement establishing BSP preceded the "Cross-Cutting Themes" policy by more than two years. Even so, the BSP design team anticipated at least four of the themes that would ultimately become S&T themes: cost-sharing, buy-ins, peer review, and information dissemination. The remaining two themes, sustainability and gender considerations, were not anticipated by BSP implementation, but it must be noted that they were never requirements of the PP or the CA.

B. COST-SHARING

Cooperative Agreements by their very nature represent significant cost-sharing approaches to the funding of activities. In the PP, the existing biodiversity efforts of WWF-US are described as exceeding US$ 5 million per year. This is several times the annual core budget of the BSP and more than total buy-ins for any single year. There is no specific matching requirement in the PP. As one S&T member observed, Consortium staff members were already working 150% on biodiversity, so it would be unseemly for A.I.D. to require an increase. On the other hand, the LAC Bureau regards its matching requirements as successful endeavors to focus NGO resources on the Bureau's strategic objectives.

The original project design takes into account the existing efforts of WWF-US and TNC in the conservation of biodiversity. Both institutions have considerable experience in managing their own investments in these activities. Assessing the efficacy of these efforts, however, goes well beyond the scope of this evaluation of the BSP.

WWF-US has traditionally been more of a grant-making organization, while TNC has traditionally been more of a technical assistance organization in its overseas operations. WRI is a slightly different type of organization, facilitating, analyzing, and disseminating information rather than focusing on field projects. Yet in some ways over the past three years, all three have borrowed practices and activities from one another and their previous differences have become less distinct.

One Regional Bureau buy-in (LAC) came with a rider requiring 1:1 matching funds from NGO implementors. Although time constraints did not allow a full examination of the effects of the matching requirement, it appears that requiring a match simply added a bureaucratic hurdle without generating any de novo investments in biodiversity conservation. In fact, it was suggested that the matching requirement had an adverse effect on spending for biodiversity. Smaller NGO's were forced to drop out of the activities when faced with the significant burden of a 1:1 matching requirement.

Annual expenditures on biodiversity conservation by WWF-US and TNC are together greater than US$ 20 million, representing a considerable contribution in cost-sharing.

C. BUY-INS

Buy-ins are a major part of the BSP effort. They represent 65% of the original total project authorization. Through FY91, buy-ins have comprised nearly 85% of total project funds (including obligations).

The PP does not describe explicitly the mechanism for buy-ins nor does it establish or require a system for tracking activities financed under those buy-ins. This became an issue with at least one Mission (USAID/Thailand) and instigated an effort by BSP staff to establish within the WWF-US accounting system a capability for more detailed reports by country and activity. When a Cooperative Agreement is amended with a Bureau or Mission buy-in, AID/Contracts will not allow the Bureau or Mission to add new reporting requirements. This is what caused the dissatisfaction in the Bangkok Mission.

BSP's only formal obligation on reporting is to S&T. This is to avoid excessive reporting requirements. Although the Evaluation Team feels this is contractually appropriate, we also feel that BSP should feel a professional responsibility to ensure adequate reporting to Missions and Bureaus collaborating with BSP.

There are as yet no mechanisms in place to measure the substantive effects of buy-ins, but many of the activities are still in the very earliest stages of implementation. This presents an opportunity to put in place a monitoring system to measure achievements.

The MOU creating the WWF-TNC-WRI joint venture specifically establishes that project implementation will be evaluated periodically "according to a system of measurable standards developed as part of the Project." (MOU:3) This would conceivably apply to both core activities and buy-ins. As yet, this aspect of the MOU has not been implemented.

Buy-ins have made an enormous contribution to the overall level of activities in the BSP. The buy-in:core ratio for field activities is greater than 4.5:1 for the BSP as a whole.

Assessing the impact of buy-ins on the Project is difficult because the goal and purpose of the BSP were defined in only the broadest of terms. Without a clear strategic plan defining the focus and direction for the BSP, we cannot judge to what extent the BSP has shaped its own program and to what extent it has been shaped by the buy-ins themselves. Buy-ins have increased the number of activities within the ample field of activities open to BSP. Rather than changing BSP focus, they have acted to shape it in a de facto sense. Buy-ins to the BSP are negotiated in an open and professional manner between BSP and A.I.D. The resulting activities reflect areas of common interest to both organizations.

Nevertheless, the program could achieve most of its original broad objectives through core funding alone, although obviously at smaller levels. The possible exception might be efforts focusing specifically on A.I.D. Bureaus and Missions. In these cases, the nature of the buy-in helps establish the close working relationship necessary to integrate BSP analysis and results into A.I.D. strategies and projects.

The willingness of BSP to accept buy-ins (and other factors such as the high quality of the staff) has contributed to the program's high regard among Regional Bureaus and Missions. On the other hand, lack of a clearly stated mission and strategy has perhaps reduced the focus and impact that BSP could have had on Bureau and Mission programs in biodiversity.

D. SUSTAINABILITY

The BSP was designed with the sustainability of project impacts in mind. The stated purpose is "to improve the capacities of non-governmental and governmental institutions ..." (CA:1). At least two of the primary project components, Training and Information Networking) focus on capacity building. A third component, Research, has been employed with a strong human resource development slant to it.

Through implementing the BSP as a Cooperative Agreement, S&T has enabled the Consortium members to expand their existing activities. BSP activities, especially the technical assistance component, have been used by Bureaus and Missions to shape and guide A.I.D. activities. The A.I.D.-NGO partnership activities under BSP have set the stage for significant investments by A.I.D. and others in biodiversity-related projects. For example, core-funded travel of BSP staff to Bangkok in February 1989 contributed to the design of the USAID/Thailand buy-in for nearly US$ 500,000 later in 1989. Examples could be drawn from any region to illustrate BSP working with A.I.D. to develop biodiversity activities. An upcoming conservation

needs assessment in Papua New Guinea will contribute to a proposal to the World Bank for GEF funds.

This successful infusion of biodiversity concerns into regular project and program activities is one aspect of ensuring the sustainability of the impacts of BSP. A second area of questions regarding sustainability has to do with the maintenance of BSP or BSP functions. Would Consortium members maintain BSP if A.I.D. funding were ended? The answer is probably "no." BSP does not now require significant investments of resources by the Consortium members into maintaining BSP. If they were asked to commit to those investments without A.I.D. funds, all three would probably choose to focus instead on their own BSP-type support functions, rather than support a potential competitor in fund raising. Indeed, all three already have BSP-type functions underway in their respective programs. BSP, as funded by A.I.D., is a mechanism to expand those activities. The Consortium members would continue their activities with or without A.I.D. funding: BSP makes the total impact greater.

E. WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT

The PP and CA make no mention of gender. Implementation of the BSP has made no explicit mention of gender-based considerations at the overall management level, based on a review of Executive Committee minutes, annual workplans, semi-annual reports, and other summary documents. An important exception is the addition to the small grants RFP that was modified for the 1992 grants competition with a specific invitation for gender-based research proposals.

On the other hand, specific field activities take gender-based considerations into account. For example, a BSP-funded research activity on traditional garden cultivars among the Maasai will have a major role for women and includes a health and nutrition component. BSP is also undertaking specific outreach efforts to facilitate the incorporation of a broader range of views into meetings and activities. For example, BSP is funding the participation of two women from Ghana at a workshop on biodiversity, rainforests, and women that is scheduled for October 1991 in Massachusetts.

It could be argued that BSP activities focus generally on the biodiversity resources themselves and therefore do not have the same opportunity to incorporate gender-based considerations into these activities. For example, a natural resource inventory is not an inherently gender-based activity. Yet BSP has a responsibility to see that the perspective and knowledge of women in biodiversity activities are ensured and that women are encouraged and empowered to take part in activity planning and decision-making.

On a more technical aspect, project data cannot be disaggregated by gender, nor do project data reflect gender considerations. These are significant aspects that should be incorporated into any evaluation and monitoring system established to track BSP activities.

With regard to BSP itself, gender-based considerations form a distinctive skewed pattern. The Executive Committee is all male (although a female served nearly two years as the WWF Alternate). The BSP senior program staff is 2:1 females:males. Overall, the BSP staff is 7:3 females:males. Given the fundamental role and considerable authority of the senior program staff, it could be argued that gender-based considerations are handled adequately.

F. PEER REVIEW

The PP (p. 28) and the CA (p. 12) both use the same language in directing that

> "[t]he [Executive] Committee will establish a peer review process for technical review of proposals by appropriate and qualified scientists."

Research is one of the four core components of the BSP. The Executive Committee examined and approved a peer review process involving a research review committee of six persons: one from WWF, one from TNC or WRI, one from A.I.D., two from the academic community, and one from the foundation community.

> The Research Review Process. The Executive Committee approves an RFP drafted with input from the research review committee. The RFP is distributed widely to reach principal investigators from LDC's. Proposals are reviewed by the research review committee, chaired by the representative from A.I.D. Grants are awarded and grantees conduct their research. Grantees prepare interim and final reports.

In the Fall of 1990, BSP initiated the first call for research proposals. Proposals were due in November, reviewed, and awards made in April of 1991. Because the research efforts funded under this component are so recent, it is premature to attempt to assess the effectiveness of the process further than to note that 165 proposals were received, of which 46 were awarded funding. An additional 22 proposals were considered worthy of funding, subject to availability of funds.

At this time, it appears that the peer review process established by BSP meets the objectives set forth in AID/S&T guidance. Evaluation of the substance of this process must await further results of the research efforts funded under the research component.

G. INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION

Information collection and dissemination is one of the four core components of BSP. A significant portion of the core funding through FY91 (27%) was allocated for these activities. The PP and CA establish information collection and dissemination (using the phrase "information and evaluation network") as specific project activities.

The BSP has not established a reference library as a centralized entity, nor has it established a formal mechanism for responding to inquiries from the field for information or publications.

The principal data base established with BSP funding is the system at WRI that tracks US-based expenditures on biodiversity-related activities. This activity is now in its third biannual iteration. The first effort was undertaken with biodiversity earmark funds through the EPM project. The second and third versions have been funded by BSP. This database is a source of fiscal data, not products or results. It does not assess the effectiveness of expenditures nor evaluate their impacts.

Although anticipated and planned for in the PP and CA, information dissemination has not been a strong component of the BSP. Outreach to the wider conservation NGO community has been limited. Staff have made an impressively large number of trips to attend meetings and conferences, but there is continuing confusion in the wider audience over the nature of BSP itself: is it a WWF program? a consortium? what are the roles of WRI and TNC? what is BSP's mission? etc.

A second information dissemination area that has not received adequate attention is outreach about BSP activities and contributions. It is particularly important for a relatively unknown (or poorly understood) program to be very deliberate in disseminating information about its own activities and accomplishments. At the same time, these outreach efforts help to explain the mission and encourage appropriate invitations for collaborative efforts. For example, BSP is finishing its third year of existence but has never issued an annual report.

The final information dissemination area that has not been stressed is the broadcasting of results and lessons learned to practitioners and project designers in all parts of the globe. BSP has an opportunity to shape the issues and solutions regarding biodiversity through deliberate efforts to assess, monitor, evaluate, and summarize these efforts around the world. Disseminating the lessons learned in a regular series of publications and public meetings could place BSP at the crest of the wave in biodiversity conservation, particularly with regard to timely subjects such as buffer zone management and integrated conservation and development projects.

CHAPTER V: MAJOR ISSUES, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

A. BIODIVERSITY SUPPORT PROGRAM STRATEGIC PLAN

1. Need for a Strategic Plan One of the principal issues that repeatedly surfaced in discussions with the Executive Committee, BSP staff, S&T staff, and others is the need for a strategic plan for BSP. To date, BSP remains primarily reactive in its activities, both buy-ins and core-funded. The general consensus is that most BSP activities are useful and that the quality of the work has been high. It is also felt strongly by many, including the Evaluation Team, that not all activities are of equal importance - that a stronger focus on the areas of greatest need would result in a greater impact.

The proper use of a Cooperative Agreement is an assistance instrument that enables A.I.D. to support the activities or program of the grantee. The lack of a strategic plan could open up the Consortium to criticisms that A.I.D. is not, indeed, buying into "their" program -- that the consortium does not have a well-defined program.

Development of a strategic plan should help BSP establish a clear identity essential in marketing itself. It would provide a framework for judging the merits of requests for assistance and for negotiating/modifying the content of buy-ins to increase their impact and utility.

The Evaluation Team believes that BSP should play a leading role in the definition of the key issues in the conservation of biodiversity in A.I.D.-assisted countries, in the distillation of lessons learned by all actors concerned, in the elaboration of innovative approaches to address the most pressing problems of the day, and in the development of biodiversity options and strategies for A.I.D. and for host-country organizations. We believe that BSP could have significantly greater impact over its proposed 10 year life if it would focus its efforts on a few areas where the needs are greatest. This would require the following:

- A strategic analysis to identify the greatest needs and opportunities for the conservation of biodiversity in A.I.D.-assisted countries.
- An analysis of BSP's strengths and capabilities in view of defining those specific areas where BSP has a comparative advantage in addressing these needs.
- Elaboration of a strategic plan to maximize these impacts.

A strategic plan should result in more effective programming of core funds in the following ways:

- It would aid in the definition of the greatest needs for technical assistance.
- It would help define the greatest needs for research and further guide the awarding of research grants.
- It would help define the greatest needs for monitoring, evaluation, and information networking. Monitoring and evaluation would, in turn, help in modifying the strategic plan.
- It would help define the greatest training needs.
- It would help define the profiles for recruitment of BSP staff.
- It would help in the elaboration of annual work plans and budgets.

2. Process The mid-term evaluation and the hiring of a new BSP Director make this an ideal time for development of a strategic plan. The key questions are who should do it and how should it be done. A number of options and alternatives were discussed during the evaluation. The following options are proposed for consideration:

Option 1: The BSP staff meets with the Executive committee to receive guidance on strategy development. The BSP would then plan a staff retreat at which the only item of business would be the development of a strategic plan. The Executive Committee members might participate pending their availability. One individual, probably a BSP staff member, would be charged with preparing a draft or sequence of drafts. The Executive Committee would review the resulting document(s) and approve a final plan.

Option 2: Each BSP senior staff person would develop a draft strategic plan for the area(s)/component(s) under her/his responsibility. A BSP retreat would refine and merge these into an overall plan for BSP. The Executive Committee would review the draft and approve a final plan.

Option 3: Given the difficulty for anyone on either the Executive Committee or the senior BSP staff to free up adequate time to draft a strategy, a consultant could act as a ghost writer for the strategic plan, basing the plan on interviews and discussion with BSP staff, Executive Committee members, A.I.D. staff, and Consortium members. The Executive Committee would review and revise the draft and approve a final.

Option 4: BSP continues to operate without a strategic plan.

The Executive Committee has decision-making authority over policy and substantive issues for BSP, and clearly would have the final word in strategy adoption. It is not clear how much time they can devote to strategy development, however. It is difficult to get the Committee together for more than an hour or two at a time. It should be their prerogative to decide on a process for strategy development. The BSP staff could take the lead in drafting a strategy. A.I.D. can provide advice, but should play no active role for the reasons given earlier.

There will be no strategic plan unless the Executive Committee and BSP management decide on a process and then allocate the time and the resources to ensure its development.

3. Suggested Content The Evaluation Team feels that in situ conservation of biodiversity issues can be generalized into two broad categories -- what to conserve and how to conserve it. There are a host of techniques and philosophical points of view on how to set geographical and sectoral priorities for the conservation of biodiversity at the country level or on broader scales. In many countries, the remaining natural areas are quite well defined and their relative importance fairly well agreed upon. Although this is not true in all countries, a "tool kit" of techniques does exist that can be applied to define priorities. (In fact, a BSP-funded project by WRI will produce a manual of these techniques.)

The question that appears to be far more challenging is how to conserve biodiversity in the face of mounting pressures from impoverished local communities. A near-consensus has developed in recent years that guns and enforcement will rarely, if ever, be sufficient to safeguard protected areas over the long term if the development needs of the surrounding populations are not addressed. The issues of conserving biodiversity in agricultural zones, plantations, and urban areas also need to be covered.

Question 10 on the questionnaire to the Missions was the following: "In your country, which question on biodiversity do you find the most vexing -- which natural areas to conserve or how to conserve them?" None of the 17 responding Missions considered which to be the hardest question, one ranked the two as equally important for them, and the rest regarded how as the more difficult question. (One respondent maintained that both questions were "merely challenging, not vexing" -- dealing with A.I.D. Washington was vexing!)

The difficulty of how to conserve natural areas surfaced frequently as a recurring theme in many of the Evaluation Team's interviews. The People and Parks (Wells, Brandon, and Hannah 1990) evaluation of 23 integrated conservation and development projects (ICDP) raised many unanswered questions about the validity

of the basic conceptual approaches of these projects. Much closer evaluation of these issues and better elaboration of approaches is clearly called for.

The Evaluation Team suggests that considerable emphasis on the question of how to conserve biodiversity, and more particularly, how to design integrated conservation and development projects, would be appropriate in any BSP strategy documents to be developed. Particular focus could be placed on a few carefully defined subject areas of particular importance (e.g., eco-tourism, natural forest management, or community-based utilization of game products).

The Team further feels that setting geographic priorities among A.I.D.-assisted countries would be inappropriate for BSP, especially as such a ranking might be applied to proposed buy-ins. Any priority ranking of countries would only discourage Missions, GAs, and NGOs in low-ranked countries from taking actions to conserve their remaining biodiversity and natural areas.

4. Country Checklists Every country and region is unique, yet there are characteristics in function and process that repeatedly appear as necessary elements for effective biodiversity conservation. The elements can be expressed in a short-hand manner in several different forms. One useful aspect of a strategic plan would be the design and testing of a country checklist or scorecard.

Experience in Latin America and elsewhere suggests a number of key elements for successful conservation (e.g., trained and motivated government agency staff, a partner NGO, basic data, community outreach, and local decision-making). By maintaining a written, documented checklist for each country, BSP would have an easily maintained and up-to-date snap-shot of country-specific priorities. This would guide BSP's own agenda (and help to shape the content of buy-ins), but could also be shared with other organizations.

The methodology of country checklist development would be a valuable tool to share with other organizations for adaptation to their specific needs and issues.

B. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF PROJECT COMPONENTS

The basic mandate of BSP is to improve the capacity to conserve biodiversity in A.I.D.-assisted countries. Five major components comprise the BSP program: Technical assistance, Research, Information and evaluation, Training, and Pilot demonstrations. The first four components are considered the BSP core components. The fifth, pilot demonstrations, is the component funded by Bureau and Mission buy-ins.

The PP provides only an illustrative budget for the allocation of core funds among components. In practice, BSP activities through FY91 have received funding in the proportions shown.

Figure V-1: Approximate Division of BSP Core Budget (Field activities, not including staff and overhead)

BSP Budget Component	Percent
Technical Assistance	14 %
Research Grants	43 %
Training	17 %
Information Networking	27 %

S&T increased the funding for Research in the amount of US$ 500,000 in June, 1990. This supposedly one-time injection has become a base increase in the funding for research.

The Evaluation Team has attempted to identify appropriate changes in the level of core funding for the project components. The development of a strategic plan would also provide a further basis for assessing the need for changes in core funding.

- Information and Evaluation Network -- We feel that this is one area that clearly needs additional resources. More emphasis needs to be placed on evaluating the impacts of project activities, on drawing out the lessons learned, and on sharing this information through information networks. The areas of emphasis should be directly in line with the overall strategic plan to be developed.

- Research -- In light of the earlier increase to this component, its considerable portion of the existing BSP field activity budget, and the amount of staff time required to manage these small grants, there is no compelling reason to consider a further increase. No change in funding level is recommended. The subject matter for future research grants should reflect the thrust of a strategic plan.

In line with our recommendations on the content of the strategic plan, the Evaluation Team feels that it would be appropriate for the BSP research component to be more strongly directed toward answering critical questions about integrating conservation and development, and to identify the most effective approaches to accomplish this.

- Training -- No change in funding level recommended, but a more attention to sharing the activities across all A.I.D. regions is called for.

- Technical Assistance -- Missions are very pleased with the quality of TA and would like to see more core funding for it. We see the TA component as critical to BSP to enable them to become more proactive and we recommend increased funding for this component.

C. REPORTING

BSP needs to make a concerted effort to improve its financial and technical reporting, especially the latter, to all collaborating and interested parties. This is the principal criticism of BSP that came out of the Mission interviews. A broader audience also exists for technical reports. Technical reporting to collaborators is one form of information networking that requires additional attention and resources.

The modifications being made to the WWF financial accounting system should largely resolve the technical problem of financial accounting to Missions and Bureaus. Once the new system is in operation, BSP management should ensure that regular financial reports reach the interested parties, whether or not they first pass through S&T.

Technical reporting is a much more important issue. Copies of technical reports generated from BSP activities need to be distributed routinely and in a timely fashion to the Missions, GAs, NGOs, and Bureaus involved. Technical reports of broader interest should get much wider distribution.

Some activities may warrant interim progress reports. As part of their routine communications with participating Bureaus and Missions, BSP program officers need to determine what detail and frequency of interim progress reports are expected, reach or negotiate an agreement acceptable to both sides, and then implement this agreement.

Reporting responsibilities need to be well defined. It might be more efficient to have one staff member responsible for ensuring that all reporting requirements are met, regardless of who writes the reports. If BSP significantly increases its evaluation, lessons learned, and information networking activities in line with its strategic plan yet to be developed, it would need a full-time professional reporting officer whose duties could include editing a BSP newsletter.

Although BSP is responsible for program implementation, A.I.D. is the sole source of funding. BSP must ensure proper acknowledgement of A.I.D. support for activities under this CA. Details of what constitutes proper acknowledgement should be determined by the Project Manager, PIAC, Executive Committee, and BSP staff.

D. BIODIVERSITY SUPPORT PROGRAM CLIENTELE

Opinions differ considerably regarding who the BSP's principal clientele should be. The Cooperative Agreement states that the purpose of the BSP is, "to improve the capacities of non-governmental and governmental institutions in A.I.D. partner countries and of A.I.D. assistance programs ..." This implies a relatively equitable mix among the three, and does not put A.I.D. programs up front.

BSP staff generally feel that A.I.D. is their principal client, as do the three A.I.D. Regional Bureaus who have funded the great majority of the buy-ins to BSP. Input on this question was also solicited from the Missions. They were asked, "Should BSP's principal mission be the support of A.I.D. Missions and Bureaus or should its principal mission be the support of A.I.D.-assisted country governments and NGOs?" With 13 Missions commenting on this question, their responses can be grouped into three equal categories:

- Four Missions stated that BSP's principal support should be for A.I.D. Missions.

- Five Missions stated that BSP's principal support should be for host-country governments and NGOs.

- Four Missions stated that the principal support should be targeted on host-country governments and NGOs, but that it should be channelled or coordinated through the Missions' programs.

The Evaluation Team recognizes that A.I.D. Missions function in support of host-country government organizations and NGOs, so that GAs and NGOs should be the principal beneficiaries of the Biodiversity Support Program. Support to, and collaboration with, A.I.D. should be viewed as a mechanism for better assisting host-country organizations.

Whether or not BSP works directly with an A.I.D. Mission, the Evaluation Team feels it is imperative that BSP obtain approval for any major activities and keep the Missions fully informed about all BSP in-country activities. Supporting A.I.D.-funded activities in an A.I.D.-assisted country without keeping the Mission fully informed is politically very risky. Mission interviews revealed that this is sometimes the case. BSP regional program officers need to do a better job of keeping Missions informed and in coordinating BSP activities with Mission programs.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE S&T CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

1. Cost-sharing. To satisfy S&T interest in assessing the cost-sharing efforts within the broad framework of the program, BSP should consider making an effort

to track activities of the Consortium members directly related to BSP activities. This could be coordinated through the Executive Committee, or managed directly between BSP senior program officers and Consortium member senior program officers.

2. Buy-ins. In order to develop a clearer agenda for BSP, the Executive Committee and BSP staff should develop a formal mission statement and strategy for the remaining two years of the Phase I Cooperative Agreement. This should be used as a negotiating platform for buy-ins and should provide criteria for becoming more selective among the universe of potential activities BSP could undertake.

The existence of a clear mission statement should also assist in the task of infusing biodiversity concerns into the strategies, projects, and programs of Regional Bureaus and Missions.

3. Sustainability. Sustainability of biodiversity-related activities should be promoted on at least three fronts: strategies, institutions, and training. BSP should undertake specific activities to (1) infuse biodiversity into A.I.D. and LDC development strategies, (2) develop and strengthen GA and NGO institutions to carry on biodiversity activities, and (3) undertake training efforts based on needs assessments to bolster the human resource available to implement activities under (1) and (2).

4. Women in Development. BSP should promote a more visible position for and explicit treatment of gender-based issues in biodiversity. Specific steps might include: (1) deliberate use of the Seminar Series to promote the role of women in biodiversity activities (e.g., demonstrate the essential role women play as senior program officers in BSP, provide role models for women in the Washington community, or report on gender-based work in biodiversity supported by BSP), (2) specific ideas for gender-based research in the illustrative list of research topics in the RFP (this was accomplished in the FY92 RFP), and (3) undertaking efforts to track gender-based impacts.

5. Peer Review. The peer review process that BSP is applying to the research apparently meets the S&T objectives and is thorough and adequate for this component.

6. Information Collection and Dissemination. The outreach function of BSP is a very significant component. It has not received the level of effort it requires. BSP should develop a specific strategy and work plan for outreach. BSP should consider creating a full-time position to direct this effort. In addition to establishing a self-contained assessment and evaluation program, this person would be responsible for capturing the experience of the broad range of biodiversity projects underway (not just the A.I.D.-assisted efforts), evaluating which were successful and why, and disseminating the lessons learned in a series of publications.

F. FINAL EVALUATION AND PREPARATION FOR PHASE II

The CBD has a 10 year LOP, but the Phase I Cooperative Agreement is for five years with an expiration date of September 30, 1993. "The final evaluation, conducted in the fifth year of the cooperative agreement, will provide the basis for an amended Project Paper for the next phase of the ten-year program. It will again analyze accomplishments, allocation of core funding and thematic foci, and assess whether to continue the cooperative agreement with WWF and the collaborating organizations, and review the adequacy of the LOP funding for the project."

This mid-term evaluation is being completed in the beginning of the fourth year after the current Cooperative Agreement was signed. Ironically, the final evaluation will need to be completed by the end of this same fourth year in order to have a Phase II Cooperative Agreement in place upon the expiration of the current CA. This conclusion came out of discussions that the Evaluation Team held with A.I.D. Grants Officer McNerny on the steps necessary to prepare Phase II of the program and the timing required to ensure continuity between Phases I and II. The key points from this discussion were:

- Phase II will require a completely new Cooperative Agreement. The only type of extension possible for a Cooperative Agreement is a no-cost extension.

- The completion date for all buy-ins to the CA must not surpass the expiration date of the CA. The length of buy-ins will have to get progressively shorter as one approaches September 30, 1993. The only way to extend a buy-in is a no-cost extension. One could have a no-cost extension to a buy-in that goes beyond September 30, 1993 only if there has been a no-cost extension to the CA. (It appears that grants awarded by BSP can have expiration dates that go beyond that of the CA.)

- To have a new CA in place upon the expiration of the current CA, the proposal/planning process must begin a full year before the expiration date.

- The planning process for the new CA must logically be preceded by a positive recommendation from the final evaluation that there should be a Phase II, as well as a recommendation regarding the form Phase II should take. Therefore, the final evaluation must be completed by the end of Year Four. The final evaluation should not wait until Year 5, contrary to the PP and CA.

- Planning for the mid-term evaluation began about 10 months ago. Therefore, the Project Manager should initiate the preparation of the SOW

for the final evaluation very soon after receiving this mid-term evaluation report.

The S&T Project Manager, BSP management, and the Executive Committee must all make every effort to make the transition to Phase II as smooth as possible. This may be particularly difficult given the preponderance of BSP funding coming from buy-ins. The fact that most of the BSP staff originally recruited using money from buy-ins have since moved to core funds will make the transition less difficult. However, the programming of field activities, about 80% of which is currently funded by buy-ins, will be much more problematic.

It is the Evaluation Team's judgement at this mid-point in the CA that there should be a Phase II, and that a new Cooperative Agreement would be an appropriate mechanism for implementing Phase II. We recommend that the SOW for the final evaluation include the following items:

- Should there be a Phase II? If so, is a Cooperative Agreement still the most appropriate mechanism for implementation?

- Should all the present members of the Consortium be included in Phase II? Should new members be added? Why? Who? Should a new Cooperative Agreement be competitively awarded?

- Are the thematic foci and the mix of core funding among them appropriate? Should the levels of core funding of any component(s) be changed? Should core funding be added for pilot projects?

APPENDIX A

Draft of May 16, 1991

OUTLINE

Scope of Work for the mid-term evaluation of the Cooperative Agreement with World Wildlife Fund (WWF) for support of the Biodiversity Support Program (BSP) which is a component of the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project (936-5554) (CBD).

I. BACKGROUND

In 1983, Section 119, entitled Endangered Species, was added to the Foreign Assistance Act (FAA). This amendment authorized A.I.D. to assist countries to : (1) protect wildlife habitats and develop sound wildlife management and plant protection programs; (2) establish and maintain parks and reserves; (3) enact and enforce anti-poaching measures, and (4) identify, study and catalog animal and plant species. The amendment also required preparation of the U.S. Strategy on the Conservation of Biological Diversity in Developing Countries, which was published in 1985.

In 1986, the FAA was amended to reflect further concern for natural resources, and to require A.I.D. to include analyses of biological diversity and tropical forest conservation needs in Country Development Strategy Statements (CDSSs) and other Action Plans. In addition, $2.5 million was earmarked for conservation activities in the FY 87 budget. The amendment addresses project implementation in specific terms, calling for close consultation and involvement of local people with projects supported by these funds and stipulating that objectives should be accomplished through projects managed by private voluntary organizations (PVOs), or international, regional, or national NGOs active in the country where the project is located. The amendment also calls for interagency and intergovernmental cooperation, increased information exchange and dialogues, and support of training and education activities which improve the capacity of recipient countries to prevent loss of biological diversity.

On September 30, 1988, a cooperative agreement (no. DHR-5554-A-00-8044-00) was signed with WWF. The agreement called for WWF to act as the lead organization in a consortium consisting of itself, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) and the World Resources Institute (WRI) in carrying out the objectives for a comprehensive program on the conservation of biological

diversity. Implementation of the Cooperative Agreement by the Consortium is through the Biodiversity Support Program (BSP). In A.I.D., the project is managed by the Science and Technology Bureau's Office of Forestry, Environment and Natural Resources (S&T/FENR).

II. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The goal of this project is to conserve biological diversity and to promote sustainable economic development in developing countries through better conservation and use of natural resources.

The purpose of the project is to improve the capacities of selected non-governmental and governmental institutions in A.I.D. host countries and of A.I.D. assistance programs to identify the critical needs for, and economic potential of, conservation and wise management of biological resources, through safeguarding ecological processes, and maintaining the diversity of genetic resources.

Objectives of the project include: (1) to identify conservation priorities; (2) to define and design research and conservation activities; (3) to provide training in framing research objectives and preparing proposals for funding; (4) to collect, evaluate, and disseminate information; and (5) to establish information networks that facilitate access for developing countries to the financial and technical resources available internationally and domestically that will support long-term biological conservation programs.

In order to achieve these objectives, the project comprises a mix of the following components: (1) technical assistance to Missions, host-country institutions and the Peace Corps; (2) a small grants program for research on specific issues generally relevant to A.I.D.'s conservation activities worldwide; (3) training to improve the quality of research and development proposals written by host-country scientists and staff from conservation organizations; (4) an information collection and dissemination network on pivotal conservation issues; and (5) pilot demonstrations. Through this last component, the project offers Missions and Bureaus the opportunity to buy-in to BSP through amendments to the cooperative agreement. Candidate buy-in topics include the first four components mentioned above, as well as projects that: (i) integrate management of biodiversity with local

development; (ii) adapt and extend the Conservation Data Center model to other LDCs; (iii) link protected area management to conservation of biodiversity through biosphere reserves, buffer zone management and transnational conservation units; (iv) promote conservation and environmental education; (v) strengthen the linkage between economics and conservation; and (vi) assist with institutional building. In this way flexibility is built into the project to enable it to respond to differing needs of host countries with projects adapted to local conditions.

The project is oriented to the delivery of assistance to countries, their governments and private organizations, so that they can perceive and act on the problems and opportunities for biological conservation in their own settings. The project should enhance the effectiveness of the cooperating private voluntary organizations, enabling them to make more constructive linkages between conservation and development. A major assumption is that better informed, trained, and motivated national officials, scientists, and citizens will work more effectively to respond to the problem of endangered species and ecosystems. The interest in finding solutions to the problems in maintaining and conserving biological diversity appear to be very broad in the international conservation and donor assistance communities. The result should be that the capabilities of participating countries will be stimulated by this project's technical assistance, research, training, data collection and exchange, and pilot demonstration activities.

III PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to review the progress made by BSP in implementing CBD, and assess the extent to which accomplishments to date will contribute to achievement of the project's objectives. The evaluation will assess the opportunities and constraints that have affected project implementation and, if necessary, recommend modifications to strengthen future implementation.

IV. STATEMENT OF WORK

A) Overall Implementation Progress and Effectiveness.

In light of the project's objectives and approaches, the evaluation team shall review the range of activities planned versus those actually implemented to address these questions:

- Project objectives and approaches - are assumptions and stated objectives still valid? If not, why?

- For each component, what are the core activities that have been implemented or are being implemented? What has been accomplished (review project outputs that address any of five objectives)? Is there evidence of the project's activities having, or likely to have, an effect in fostering conservation of biological diversity in host countries? What potential exists for longer-term impacts?

- Is there evidence to date of activities that are not making progress towards achieving intended objectives? To what extent can lack-of-progress be attributed to design weaknesses, implementation constraints or developments that were not foreseen? Should these issues be addressed? In what ways, if any, will addressing them affect the original intent of the Cooperative Agreement?

B) Program Management

Effective implementation of the various components of BSP depends to a great extent on the staffing level and quality of staff resources available to BSP, as well as the quality of the interaction among all participants. The evaluation team shall assess program management using the questions provided below.

- What, if any, are the shortcomings in the existing management arrangements between S&T/FENR and the consortium on the one hand, and WWF and the other members of the consortium on the other? How can they be addressed to improve project performance?

- Based on an assessment of the quality of reports produced, and responses from A.I.D. Missions, are the staffing levels and quality of technical personnel fielded by the project grantees adequate for effective implementation of CBD's various components? Have services delivered to Missions and host-countries been timely and cost-effective?

- Management arrangements between consortium members: Are there clear lines of responsibilities and accountability in the management arrangements between WWF, the WRI, and TNC? In what ways did these arrangements foster collaboration in implementing CBD activities such as fielding technical assistance teams, implementing training programs, preparing project reports/documentation, and responding to AID/W and Mission requests? What constraints exist, if any? How should these be addressed?

- What mechanisms, if any, have been used to: a) encourage A.I.D. Missions to use CBD buy-in services; and, b) encourage other donors to support CBD activities?

C): Cross-Cutting Themes

The Evaluation Team will evaluate the themes as outlined in Appendix 3 of the official S&T Program Guidance dated 17 January 1991, in regards to the Cooperative Agreement, and will answer the relevant questions contained therein.

D): Future BSP Implementation: Issues and Recommendations

- What is the prospect for the project achieving its objectives within time and funds remaining?

- Which, if any, of the five components identified in the cooperative agreement might warrant additional effort? How are decisions made in effort (funds and staff time) allocated among the components of the project?

- Is it necessary to re-design this project to permit achievement of the full range of planned outcomes, due to new knowledge, constraints or opportunities?

- What actions/changes might S&T/FENR take to facilitate the activities of the BSP?

V. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be conducted via the use of an IQC firm or similar arrangement that will work out the logistics of the evaluation, and will put together the evaluation team with approval of S&T/FENR in consultation with BSP.

The evaluation team will review project documents, correspondence, and all other related records, while conducting interviews with key personnel responsible for managing and implementing project activities, and exercise independent judgment in assessing overall progress and accomplishments of BSP over the past two-and-a-half years. Specifically, the evaluation team will perform the following tasks:

TASK 1: Review of Project Documents

Review relevant BSP documents, including the A.I.D. policy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity, the Cooperative Agreement--its amendments, contractor reports on project

activities, special events and regional activities/ trip reports. It is expected that the primary sources of documents will be the lead agency, WWF. Documentation will also be found in the FENR Office of the S&T Bureau and possibly several USAID field Missions.

TASK 2: Interviews

Interviews will be carried out with BSP staff, persons in the NGO's comprising the consortium (WWF, TNC, and WRI), A.I.D. Offices in the Central and Regional Bureaus, contractors, and other individuals who have dealt with or worked for the BSP, Mission staff, host-country staff of institutions that have had contact or relationships with BSP, and other individuals who have dealt with the project and whose input may be relevant.

TASK 3: Visits to USAID Missions, Field Projects

Preliminary discussions with BSP Staff indicate that field visits may not be necessary for the purpose of this evaluation, but that telephone and fax communications with appropriate Mission staff will be fruitful. However, the evaluation team may recommend one or two field visits after consultation and discussion with BSP, S&T/FENR, and selected missions if the team feels it will be useful and relevant to do so.

VI. TIME FRAME

The evaluation will take place over a six-week period as follows:

Weeks 1 and 2: Document Review and Washington interviews.

Weeks 3 and 4: Fax and telephone interviews, and potential travel.

Week 5: Prepare and present Draft Report.

Week 6: Revise, submit and brief on the Final Report.

VII. REPORTING/DELIVERABLES

The contractor shall submit the following reports relating to specific tasks:

1. A list of documents reviewed at the end of activities related to Task 1 and reviewed by BSP and A.I.D. for completeness.

2. The draft report (10 copies) shall be submitted to the CBD Project Manager who will distribute them for review and comment by BSP staff and the members of the Project Implementation Advisory Committee by the end of the activities outlined in Tasks 1 through 5. This should include: (a) a final, annotated list of all documents reviewed; (b) the list of persons actually interviewed, the date of the interview, their connection with the project, and any other information pertinent to understanding the BSP. The format for a Final Report should follow the recommendation in the A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook, Report No. 7 (TM 3S:15) and more specifically in S&T Program Guidance 91-06.

4. A Final Report to the A.I.D. Project Manager, including an Executive Summary, within two weeks of receiving comments on the Draft Report .

VIII. TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation team should include three people, one of whom should be an A.I.D. staff member not directly associated with the project, who have the following kinds of expertise:

Team Leader: A senior expert knowledgeable about A.I.D. development assistance programs and the design/implementation of PVO and NGO technical assistance and institution-building programs in the biodiversity field. International experience is essential, and the Team Leader must also have extensive experience working for (or with) NGO's in one or more regions in biodiversity. Biodiversity conservation and natural resource management background are also essential.

The Team Leader will be responsible for overall quality of the evaluation and its individual components. In addition, the Team Leader will assess the project management. The Team Leader will have primary responsibility for editing the final text, formulating conclusions, generating suggestions for project improvement, and outlining suggested future directions.

Natural Resources Specialist: The Natural Resources Specialist should have extensive experience in natural resources planning and project implementation. Previous experience in the evaluation of natural resource PVO/NGO projects and programs is essential. This individual shall be responsible for linking biodiversity efforts to the larger world of environmental

planning. He/She will have the greatest role to play in conceptualizing the BSP objectives in light of sustainable development.

Conservation Biologist: The Conservation Biologist should have a good background in the area of plant or animal systematics and should demonstrate a history of understanding the importance of linking biodiversity issues and conservation. He/she will be responsible for evaluating both the conservation aspects of the BSP, understanding the role of research, and other activities, for example, inventories.

The Conservation Biologist will be responsible for the technical review of activities. He/She will evaluate the effectiveness of project activities in meeting their technical goals. This specialist will also be responsible for the evaluation of project components dealing with information networking, and will also be responsible for sharing interview responsibilities with the Team Leader.

The A.I.D. Project Manager will have final approval of the selection of appropriate individuals to fill the positions above cited, and will, of course, consult extensively with BSP in order to assure the quality and objectivity of individuals for the team.

In addition, S&T/FENR will provide a staff member at least part-time who will be able to backstop the process and provide logistical support.

Present A.I.D. policy also requires that a liaison from the Program Office be involved with the evaluation to help assure conformance to A.I.D. rules and regulations concerning such things as the objectivity of the evaluation process.

Wang #4933L

APPENDIX B

AID 1330-24 (3-78)

PROJECT DESIGN SUMMARY
LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

Life of Project:
From FY 88 to FY 97
Total U.S. Funding $21,700
Date Prepared: 5/24/88

Project Title & Number: Conservation of Biological Diversity No. 936-5554

NARRATIVE SUMMARY	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	MEANS OF VERIFICATION	IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS
Program or Sector Goal: The broader objective to which this project contributes: To promote sustainable economic development in developing countries through better conservation and use of biological resources.	Measures of Goal Achievement: New or revised national development plans that incorporate conservation issues and needs and increased action at the local level in conservation education, research and training and protected area management.	Review of LDC national development plans, NGO program documentation both national and international policy statements, etc. of MDBs.	Assumptions for achieving goal targets: Better informed (thru this project) and trained LDC officials, scientists, and private citizens will respond to the problem of endangered ecosystems and species.
Project Purpose: To improve the capacities of selected developing countries and A.I.D. assistance programs to identify the critical needs for economic potential of conserving and better managing biological resources, safeguarding ecological processes, and maintaining genetic diversity.	Conditions that will indicate purpose has been achieved: End of project status. Conservation priorities in selected countries established for research and development and activities initiated to address them by governments, NGOs, Missions, and other donors.	Reports of technical assistance missions, and CDSSs, ARSs, and LDC institutional budgets and grantee annual work plans.	Assumptions for achieving purpose: A.I.D. Missions will respond to amendments to the FAA on biological diversity and tropical forests particularly when the economic evidence for investments in natural resources conservation is better articulated.
Outputs: (1) Short-term technical assistance to host government institutions and Missions on the range of research and programmatic needs related to conservation. (2) Small research grants to address generic questions relevant to A.I.D.'s worldwide program. (3) Training in research design and grant applications. (4) Information and Evaluation networking.	Magnitude of Outputs: - Enhanced practical efforts in conservation under way in 20 priority countries. - Better capacity to structure and obtain funding for R&D in 10 countries. - Results of research on 4-5 conservation issues available. - Increased investments in conservation by A.I.D. Missions and other donors.	Same as above, plus debriefing from Missions, Regional Bureaus and grantees, mid-project and end-of-project evaluations.	Assumptions for achieving outputs: Bureaus and Missions will request assistance and invest in conservation; the cooperating organizations will provide well-defined technical support and project management; critical issues can be identified for research; better and more complete information is required by A.I.D. and other donors.
Inputs: (1) A.I.D. project manager and travel budget. (2) S&T/FENR budget allocations FY 88 thru FY 89. 10 years @ 800,000 per year = $8 million. (3) Regional Bureau and Mission buy-ins. 10 years = $15 million.	Implementation Target (Type and Quantity) Technical Assistance Missions (42) Training Activities (18) Small Research Grants (20) Computerized Data Base (1) Information Network (1) Information Synthesis (18) Seminars (4) Technical Reports (3)	Progress reports from grantee, vouchers, and S&T/FENR management reviews. Analysis of Evaluation Reports and CDSSs.	Assumptions for providing inputs: Agency and S&T budget allocations for biological diversity will continue to have a high priority; a suitable grantee is agreed upon by the Agency.

Appendix B

APPENDIX C

Appendix C
List of People Contacted for BSP Mid-Term Evaluation
September - October 1991

Part 1: Washington-based

09-04 Mary Tondreau, President of TvT Associates

09-05 BSP Executive Committee meeting and luncheon. Brief introductions of BSP Executive Committee members: Gregory Miller, Alan Randall, Walter Arensberg, Nels Johnson, and Michael Wright; for BSP: Kathy Saterson, Les Whitmore, Meg Symington, Jim Webster, Ilana Locker, Norah Heckman.

Dr. Seymour (Sy) Sohmer, S&T Project Manager for the Conservation of Biological Diversity Project which includes BSP

09-06 Meeting at S&T with Sy Sohmer, Dan Deely, Mike Benge, Ian Morison, John Wilson, and Tim Resch

Delivery of BSP Briefing Books (3 volumes) to Evaluation Team

Bruce Leighty, BSP Senior Program Officer

09-10 Dr. Gary Hartshorn, WWF Vice President for Science, WWF Representative on BSP Executive Committee and former BSP Director

09-11 Dr. Frank Zadroga, AID Affaires Office, Mexico. (Telephone interview)

09-13 Alan Randall, TNC Representative on BSP Executive Committee

Dr. Gregory Miller, TNC Regional Director for South America and TNC Representative on BSP Executive Committee

Frank Alejandro, S&T Evaluation Officer

Angela McNerny, AID Contracts Specialist for BSP Cooperative Agreement

09-16 Tom Gilbert, Consultant working on the Gambia Mission buy-in to BSP

Dr. Gary Hartshorn

09-17 Michael Wright, WWF Representative on BSP Executive Committee

Dr. Sy Sohmer

BSP seminar given by Dr. Rodrigo Gamez Lobo on INBio in Costa Rica

09-18 Walter Arensberg, WRI Representative on BSP Executive Committee

Dr. Rodrigo Gamez Lobo, Director of INBio and recipient of BSP funding for parataxonomist training.

Kate Newman, BSP Program Officer for Africa

09-19 Dan Deely, S&T/FENR Forestry and former Project Manager for CBD/BSP

Nels Johnson, WRI Representative on BSP Executive Committee and recipient of BSP grant for study on how different organizations develop geographic priorities for the conservation of biodiverisity

Janet Abramovitz, WRI Research Analyst conducting BSP study on what American organizations are spending on biodiversity.

Dr. Mary Lou Higgins, WWF Senior Program Officer for South America and former S&T Project Manager for EPM Project.

09-20 BSP Executive Committee: Gregory Miller, Alan Randall, Walter Arensberg, Nels Johnson, and Michael Wright.

James Tarrant, ENE/TR/ANR re BSP activities planned for Europe. (telephone interview)

09-23 Dr. Kathy Saterson, BSP Director

Dr. Janis Alcorn, BSP Senior Program Officer for Asia Region

09-24 Dr. Bruce Stein, TNC/Latin America Science Program/Director

Brian Houseal, TNC/Latin America Division/Stewardship Director

Dr. Kathy Saterson

Dr. Meg Symington, BSP Senior Program Officer for Latin America and the Caribbean

Dr. John Wilson, AID/LAC/DR/E Deputy Chief Environmental Officer

09-26 Bruce Leighty, BSP Senior Program Officer

Dr. Sy Sohmer

09-27 Dr. Jim Hester, AID/LAC/DR/E Chief Environmental Officer

John Wilson, AID/LAC/DR Deputy Environmental Officer

Molly Kux, AID/APRE/DR Chief Environmental Officer

09-30 Dr. Gary Wetterberg, USDA/FS/IF/FSP Manager

Julia Morris, USDA/FS/IF/FSP Coordinator for Africa Region (Telephone Interview)

Scott Lampman, USDA/FS/IF/FSP Coordinator for Latin America Region

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

On 1 October 1991 with the start of the new fiscal year, many of the AID offices changed to new names.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

10-01 Julia Morris

10-02 Tim Resch, AFR/ARTS/FARA Tropical Forestry and Biodiversity Advisor

Gary Cohen, AFR/ARTS/FARA Project Manager for AFR/NRMS

Dr. Twig Johnson, AID/R&D/ENR Director

Part 2: Mission-based

Africa Bureau

Tanzania	John Rose

Asia Bureau

Indonesia	Jerry Bisson
Nepal	Tracey Parker
Papua New Guinea	Louis Kuhn
South Pacific	Jim Osborne
Sri Lanka	Malcolm Jansen
Thailand	Will Knowland

Latin America and the Caribbean

Belize	Jeff Allen
Brazil	Eric Stoner
Costa Rica	Ann Lewandowski
Ecuador	Ron Ruybal
Jamaica	Mark No
Mexico	Frank Zadroga
Peru	Rudy Griego
Region Office/Caribbean	Al Merkel

APPENDIX D

Appendix D
Part 1: Documents and Reports examined
(listed alphabetically by author)

AAAS Fellows

1989 DRAFT *AAAS Fellows' Working Paper on the Biodiversity Conservation Strategy of the U.S. Agency for International Development.* Prepared in collaboration with the Agency Biological Diversity Working Group. Washington DC. (December 1989 version) p. 18. (/)

December 1989 draft of a biodiversity conservation strategy prepared for A.I.D. by AAAS Fellows.

Abramovitz, J. A.

1989 *A Survey of U.S.-Based Efforts to Research and Conserve Biological Diversity in Developing Countries.* Washington: CIDE/WRI, p. 71. (/)

Results of a survey of US-based organizations that had undertaken biodiversity and conservation activities in developing countries in 1987.

Abramovitz, J. A.

1991 *Investing in Biological Diversity:U.S. Research and Conservation Efforts in Developing Countries.* Washington: WRI, p. 94. (++)

Results of a survey of US-based organizations that had undertaken biodiversity and conservation activities in developing countries in 1989. Comparisons to the report (1989) on 1987 spending.

Alho, C.

1990 *Propuesta para criaçào de uma unidade de conservaçào na Regiào de Tombalí.* Guiné-Bissau. p. 28 + 4 appendices.

A consulting report proposing the creation of a conservation unit in southern Guinea-Bissau, with a proposed action plan.

Anonymous.

1990 *Conserving Tropical Forests and Biological Diversity: 1988-1989 Report to Congress on the USAID Program.* Washington: USAID, p. 44. (/)

AID report to Congress for FY88 and FY89, citing specific projects as well as overall spending on tropical forests and biodiversity.

Brown, J.

1990 *Study Tour for Caribbean Conservation Professionals on "Stewardship and Interpretation of Natural Areas"*. Ipswich MA: ACE report to BSP, p. 11 + p. 59 Appendices. (++)

Report on the study tour and training internships for participants from Caribbean NGO offices.

Brown, M.

1990 *Buffer Zone Management in Africa Workshop organized by the PVO-NGO/NRMS Project.* Washington: PVO-NGO/NRMS Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 12. (+)

Consultant's trip report on a workshop on buffer zone management.

Brown, M., A. Singer and R. Buckley.

1991 *Buffer Zone Management in Africa*. Washington: PVO-NGO/NRMS Project, p. 98. (++)

Report of a workshop on buffer zone management held 5 - 11 October 1991 in Queen Elizabeth National Park, Uganda.

Brown, Nicholas R.

1990 "Anthropogenic Climate Change and Agriculture in Thailand." Bangkok: Paper Presented to the National Biological Conference of Thailand, 22-24 October, 1990, p. 14. (-)

Paper on climate change and recommendations for a response by Thai scientists in anticipation of some of the impacts.

Cohen, A. S.

1991 *Report on the First International Conference on the Conservation and Biodiversity of Lake Tanganyika*. Washington: BSP, p. 128 (French: *Compte Rendu de la Première Conférence Internationale sur la Conservation et la Biodiversité du Lac Tanganyika*). (++)

Proceedings and report of a 3-day, 12-country, 65-participant conference on conservation of Lake Tanganyika.

Commemorative issue of *Boletin do Museu paraense Emilio Goeldi*. Museu Goeldi - NYBG publication (in press).

Costanza, R., (Ed.)

1991 *Ecological Economics: The Science and Management of Sustainability.* New York: Columbia University Press, p. 525. (++)

Proceedings and papers of a workshop held on Maryland's Eastern Shore.

Costanza, R., B. Haskell, L. Cornwell, H. Daly and T. Johnson.
1990 *The Ecological Economics of Sustainability: Making local short-term goals consistent with global and long-term goals.* Washington: The World Bank Working Paper #32, p. 97 Internal Document. (++)

A catalog of the papers (with abstracts) from a workshop on ecological economics.

Dinerstein, Eric; and Wikramanayake, Eric D.
1991 Beyond "Hotspots": Use of conservation models to prioritize investments in biodiversity in the Indo-Pacific region. DRAFT. p. 23 plus illustrations.

Options and priorities for biodiversity conservation in the Indo-Pacific region. (Not a BSP product, but reviewed during the evaluation.)

Donaldson, J. T.
1990 *Marine Species Diversity and International Development: Guidelines for Biodiversity Support.* BSP Internal Report, p. 129. (++)

A summary report on marine biodiversity and options for AID actions and involvement.

Doungoube Gustav & Nambardin.
1991 *Dzanga-Sangha Rèserve Spèciale de Forêt Dense et Parc National de Dzanga - Ndoki* (Poster) WWF-US/R.C.A. (-)

A color poster, printed on recycled paper.

Fay, M., A. Vedder, and W. Weber.
1991 *Conservation of the Northern Forests of the Peoples' Republic of Congo: Nouabale-Ndoki National Park and Forest Resource Conservation.* New York: WCI Proposal to USAID, p. 31 + 11 annexes. (-)

Proposal to AID for US$ 2.5M over five years for conservation activities.

Gilbert, V.C. (Tom) and A. Camara, et al.
1990 *Kiang West National Park: An Integrated Conservation and Village Development Project.* Washington: BSP, p. 41 + 11 annexes. (++)

A field report proposing the establishment of Kiang West National Park.

Groenfeldt, D.
1990 *The Beavoha Irrigation Project (Beza Mahafaly Reserve, Madagascar).* Consultant's paper. p. 38 + p. 12 appendices. (-)

Consultant report from a field examination of an irrigation scheme in Madagascar.

Groenfeldt, D., J. Alcorn, S. Berwick, D. Flickinger, and M. Hatziolos.
1990 *Opportunities for Eco-Development in Buffer Zones: An Assessment of Two Cases in Western India.* Washington: BSP, p. 72 + p. 35 appendices. (++)

Consulting report on the restoration potential for project sites in buffer zones of reserves in India.

Gnusletter.
1991 A quarterly newsletter of Antelope Specialist Group, IUCN Species Survival Commission. Vol. 10, No. 1. (++)

Grigione, Melissa M.
1990 *Conservation of Africa's Western Rift Lakes.* ca. p. 150 unnumbered. (+/-)

A review of the biodiversity of African Rift lakes and options for conservation efforts.

Haltenorth et Diller.
1991 *Guide des Mammifères à Bayanga.* p. 90. (-)

A simple guide to mammals of Bayanga, with basic line drawings and descriptions of the species.

Hanrahan, M. S. and J. Pereira.
1990 *"Manejo de la Zona del Gran Sumaco Provincia del Napo, Ecuador." "Management of the Gran Sumaco Zone, Napo Province, Ecuador."* DESFIL #DHR 5438-C-00-6054-00 w/USAID and AID/Quito, p. 104.

Hartshorn, G.

1989 *Proposed Components of the USAID Buy-In for Biological Diversity Research and Conservation.* MANRES/BRM Element II. (++)

Descriptions of potential buy-ins to AID/Thailand MANRES project.

Hartshorn, G.

1989 Work Plan for the USAID Buy-in, *Biological Diversity Research and Conservation*, MANRES/BRM Element II. Washington: BSP report to USAID/Bangkok, p. 21. (++)

Descriptions of potential buy-ins to AID/Thailand MANRES project, with calendar time-frame.

Hartshorn, G., B. Kattel, M. Hunter, J. Mehta, B. Thapa, and R. Shrestha.

1989 *Feasibility Assessment for Creating the Nepal Conservation Training and Research Institute (NECTARI).* Washington: WWF, p. 62. (-)

Feasibility study and budget for a research and training institute at Royal Chitwan national park in Nepal.

Hartshorn, L.

1989 *Zoo Tour.* p. 16. (-/+)

Trip report of study tour with participants from the Bangkok zoological park.

Humphrey, S. R. and J. R. Bain.

1990 *Endangered Animals of Thailand* Flora and Fauna Handbook 6. Gainesville FL: Sandhill Crane Press, p. 468. (Not a BSP-supported product, but purchased by BSP for distribution.)

Hunsicker, P.

1991 *Saputu's Magical Night.* p. 58. (-)

An environmental story book for children.

IFAR.

1990 *Ex Situ Conservation: Present Status and Future Priorities.* Sept. 21, 1990, p. 90 + p. 58 appendices. (?)

A report on ex situ conservation measures prepared as part of Project Noah, in response to a directive from Congress.

Inigo, E.
1991 *Investigaciones para la Conservación de la Reserva de la Biósfera Montes Azules en la Selva Lacandona, Chiapas, México.* ECOSFERA, México.

Johnson, D. V.
1990 *Report on Technical Assistance to the USAID Mission in Guiné-Bissau on the Subject of Conservation of Biological Diversity.* Washington: BSP, p. 11 + appendices. (++)

Feasibility study and recommendations for creating a conservation unit in southern Guinea-Bissau.

Leighty, B.
1991 *"Some Thoughts on Marine Biodiversity and the Role of Integrated Coastal Management"* pp.48-50 IN Ed. J. R. Clark: *The Status of Integrated Coastal Zone Management: A Global Assessment.* The Coastal Area Management and Planning Network (CAMPNET). U Miami, FL. (-)

Contribution by BSP staff member.

Lisansky, S. G. and J. Coombs.
1990 *Biodiversity Funding Mechanisms* (Possible Funding Mechanisms for a Convention on Biological Diversity). CPL Scientific Ltd. Science House, Newbury, UK, p. 33. (/)

A brief analysis of potential mechanisms to raise funds for implementing the proposed Convention on Biological Diversity.

McKay, K.L., R. DuBois and L. Hughes.
1991 *A.I.D. Wetlands Activities - Report to Congress.* Bethesda: DAI, p. 90. (-)

Draft report to Congress on AID activities affecting wetlands. Includes 58 one-page data sheets on these projects.

McNeely, J.A., K.R. Miller, W.V. Reid, R.A. Mittermeier, T.B. Werner.
1990 *Conserving the World's Biological Diversity.* IUCN, WRI, WWF-US, World Bank, Washington. p. 193. (/)

Moad, A. and L. Whitmore.
1991 "Management of Primary and Secondary Tropical Forest in the Asia-Pacific Region." In *Proceedings of Environment and Agriculture Officer's Conference 9-17 September 1991.* Manuscript.

Neill, D.
1990 *Dendrological survey of the Elias Meneces Experimental Forest, Chore Production Forest Reserve, Santa Cruz, Bolivia.* Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 3 (Spanish: *Inventario dendrológico del Bosque Experimental "Elias Meneces" Reserva Forestal de Producción, Santa Cruz, Bolivia* p. 10 + species lists.) (++)

Report from a technical mission to Bolivia for dendrological inventory and training in the eastern part of the country.

OTS/AIBS: *Tropinet.* Ed: B. Braker and L. McDade. 1990/91. (++)

Supplement Numbers 26, 27, 28, 29. A quarterly newsletter published by the Association for Tropical Biology and the Organization for Tropical Studies.

Rigby, John.
1990 *Summary Report (of Philippine Foundation Design).* WWF/BSP, p. 11 + Attachments. (++)

A consultant's report on the feasibility of establishing a trust in the Philippines for nature conservation purposes.

Robinson, A. and W. Siswanto.
1990 *Traveling Seminar: Komodo National Park, Dumoga Bone National Park and Bunaken Manado Tua Marine National Park.* Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 19.

Robinson, A.
1990 *The Bunaken Manado Tua Marine National Park, Pre-Planning Workshop.* Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 37.

Robinson, A. and W. Siswanto.
1990 *Final Report and Recommendations.* Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 34.

Robinson, A.
1990 *Final Report of Grant.* Consultant's Report to BSP, p. 37.

12

Santisuk, T., T. Smitinand, W. Hoamuangkaew, P. Ashton, S.H. Sohmer, and J.R. Vincent.

1991 *Plants for Our Future: Botanical Research and Conservation Needs in Thailand.* Bangkok: RFD, p. 48 + draft summary for Donor/Royal Thai Government. (-)

A report of a consulting team's assessment of botanical conservation needs in Thailand.

Sevilla Larrea, R. and A. Umaña Quesada.

1990 *¿Por Qué Canjear Deuda por Naturaleza?* Washington: WRI, p. 30 (++)

Discussion of the debt-for-nature swaps with a focus on Latin American cases: Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Bolivia.

Sheldon, Douglas L.

1991 Memo to S&T Office Directors. Subject: FY 1991 Regional Bureau Review of the S&T Portfolio for Field Support. 16 August 1991.

Results of a review by Regional Bureaus of S&T portfolio, with rankings (high-medium-low) of projects. CBD (BSP) received a "high" ranking from AFR and APRE, with a "medium" from LAC.

Shores, John N.

1991 "Forestry and Biodiversity: a Briefing Book for University Programs." Report prepared for World Resources Institute's Program on Forestry and Biodiversity. (unpublished) World Resources Institute, Washington DC, p. 33 plus reference files. (/)

A report consisting of summaries and key quotations drawn from recent literature, focusing on forestry's role and potential for conserving biodiversity.

Shores, John N.

1991 *Where in the World is Biodiversity? an identification of priority sites and required actions for conserving biodiversity -- based on global and regional reviews.* Prepared for World Resources Institute's Program on Forestry and Biodiversity. (unpublished) World resources Institute, washington DC, p. 34 plus tables. (/)

A compilation of data from global and regional reviews to identify geographic priorities, specific protected areas, and conservation actions. Includes tables comparing countries and regions of the world according to "hotspots" techniques.

Smitinand, Ted, and Larsen, Kai. (general eds.)

1989 *Flora of Thailand*. Vol III, Part 4, Pteridophytes. Edited by M. Tagawa and K. Iwatsuki. Chutima Press, Bangkok. (other volumes not yet received) (++)

One part of a continuing series of scientific publications on the flora of Thailand. This publication covers the Pteridophytes.

Stancioff, A.

1991 *Deforestation in the Congo Basin: Review of USAID/WWF Project Goals and Discussions of G.I.S. and Remote Sensing Applications to Monitoring of Deforestation of the Congo Basin*. Draft paper for USAID AFR/TR and WWF, p. 56 + appendices. (-)

Consulting report on a proposed project in the Congo Basin.

Stromme, D.M. and P.H. Hunsicker.

1991 *Let's Play Rain Forest -- Nature Games*. WWF, Washington, p. 38. (-)

Pamphlet of nature-based games for children.

USAID/Ecuador.

1989 *Natural Resources, Forests, and Biological Diversity in Ecuador: A Strategy for USAID*. USAID 8 September 1989, p. 9. Photocopy.

USAID/S&T

1991 Yellow-Top Guidance on Administrative Procedures for Conducting Evaluations. Memo. Washington DC. 17 January 1991. (Includes "S&T Cross-Cutting Evaluation Themes".)

Wilson, E. O. (Ed.)

1988 *Biodiversity*. National Academy Press. Washington: National Academy Press, p. 521. (Not a BSP-supported product, but BSP purchased 450 copies for distribution.)

Proceedings of the National Forum on Biodiversity, held in Washington 21 - 24 September 1986.

WRI-IUCN-UNEP

1991 SECOND DRAFT Global Biodiversity Strategy: Guidelines for Action to Save, Study, and Use Earth's Biotic Wealth Sustainably and Equitably. Biodiversity Strategy Programme, prepared in consultation with FAO and Unesco. 22 September 1991, p. 157.

Options and recommended actions for saving the planet's biodiversity. (Not a BSP product, but consulted during the evaluation)

WWF/OPD.

1991 *A Guide to Designing Effective Proposals.* Washington: BSP and WWF/ODP, p. 114. (-)

Guidebook to NGO proposal preparation, in the form of a handbook with a number of worksheets. Includes a glossary of terms.

WWF/ODP.

1991 *A Guide to Financial Resources Development.* Washington: BSP and WWF/ODP (in press).

Notes: Entries with summaries were examined by one or more members of the Evaluation Team. Entries without summaries were not examined (some have not been published or released yet).

Credit and Acknowledgements (++) indicates credit given to the joint venture or to the three members of the Consortium, (+) indicates credit given to BSP, (-) indicates no credit given to BSP but credit given to WWF-US, (/) indicates not a BSP-supported product.

Part 2: AID Files Consulted

Asia Bureau Initiatives

APRE ABS FY93 Alliance for Environment in Asia (AEA)

Cable traffic

Memos regarding Asia Environmental Alliance (AEA)

BSP Activities Log

Bi-monthly activities reports from BSP

Prospectus for a Natural Resources Assessment of Papua New Guinea.

Memo from G Hartshorn describing the "Relationship of the BSP to WWF"

BSP Africa Projects

18 Mar 91 Cable from Bangui/CAR requesting funds for anti-poaching project $15,650

Letters to Mission Directors describing BSP staff travel and requesting clearances

25 Apr 91 Cable from Dakar/Senegal

Implementation Plan for the Congo Basin Studies

NRMS Project Paper Supplement increasing funds to $27.87M

13 Feb 91 Cable from Lilongwe/Malawi with elephant management proposal $634,000

BSP Budgets/Contracts

PIO/T 1361557 Amendment 1 (CBD) increase to $652,315

PIO/T 1361557 original, $263,615

PIO/T 1361262 Biodiversity earmark of $1,000,000

PIO/T 0361441 Amendment 1 increase to $2,198,000 Aug 90

PIO/T 0361441 Amendment 2 increase to $2,333,863 Sept 90

BSP Buy-ins and "Buy-ins"

General correspondence: AID/Contracts to and from BSP

PIO/T 1303346 (WID 930-0200) increase of $30,000 case study

BSP Buy-ins (Africa)

12 Apr 90 DRAFT Cable to Kinshasa re BSP support to WCI project $18,700

Biodiversity, Development, and Global Climate Change in Africa: a proposal for a buy-in from AID/AFR to BSP. Jun 91

PIO/T NRMS 698-0467 increase of 1,440,000 to BSP

Kiang West National Park: a proposal for a buy-in from USAID/Gambia to BSP. Jul 91

BSP Buy-ins (APRE)

Proposal to APRE Bureau for a Buy-in to Cooperative Agreement for Conservation Efforts in Asia and the Pacific. $450,000 Aug 91

24 May 90 Cable from Kathmandu/Nepal to BSP requesting overdue reports and expressing disappointment in NECTARI implementation. Urging WWF to assign a full-time on-site director for NECTARI.

BSP Buy-ins (Europe)

Easter Europe Program Add-on to Cooperative Agreement $311,000

Protection and Enhancement of Biological Diversity in Central and Eastern Europe DRAFT. $1,100,000

BSP Buy-ins (LAC)

PIO/T 1651018 (Global Climate Change 598-0784) for southern Mexico (5-7 buffer zone sites) $650,000 Jul 91

Memo from G Hartshorn to J Hester "Recommendations for Funding LAC Biodiversity Proposals"

18 May 90 Cable from La Paz/Bolivia, endorsing David Neill (MBG) field trip to Bolivia under BSP

PIO/T 1651019 (GCC) for Mexico $160,000 Jul 91

18

Thailand Buy-ins (wind down)

07 Aug 91 Cable from Bangkok re outstanding $449,993 since Aug '89.

07 May 91 Cable from Bangkok with comments of draft BSP evaluation SOW

05 Feb 91 Cable from Bangkok welcoming S Sohmer to S&T and requesting assistance in clarifying WWF (BSP) billing situation.

Letter from B Leighty to S Sohmer responding to Bangkok cable 05 Feb 91.

Correspondence regarding "wind down" of AID/Thailand and exemption of CBD project.

Proposal from Penny Levin for a "Positive Co-existence Project" on villages and forestry. $111,870/3 years. Jun 90

BSP Cooperative Agreement Document

Copy of Cooperative Agreement DHR-5554-A-00-8044-00 between AID and WWF. $12,844,931. 30 Sep 88

BSP General Correspondence

e.g. five LDC participants to Pacific Science Congress in Hawaii

e.g. 22 Mar 91 S. Sohmer to G. Hartshorn: (1) obtain full-time director for BSP, (2) establish budget reporting, maybe FSP model, (3) routine reporting schedule for work plans, progress reports, monthly highlights.

e.g. Correspondence on staffing/hiring/new positions

e.g. Weekly highlights

BSP Evaluation - Drafts of SOW and Comments

05 Apr 91, 15 Apr 91, 17 Apr 91, 24 Apr 91, 29 Apr 91, 03 May 91, 07 May 91, 15 May 91 (Final) Drafts of the BSP Mid-Project Evaluation SOW.

BSP Evaluation -- Background Documents

AID Evaluation Handbook. PN-AAL-086 April 1989.

Yellow-Top Guidance on Administrative Procedures for Conducting Evaluations. 17 Jan 1991

Sample Statement of Work (SOW) documents from other evaluations

S&T Program Guidance "Cross-Cutting Evaluation Themes" Jan 91.

BSP Director Search

BSP Buy-in (Eastern Europe)
PIO/T 1183005 (180-0039 Improved Public Sector Environmental Services Project) $800,000 Jun 91

BSP Evaluation Log
(mostly FAX records to/from Missions expressing interest in Mid-Project Evaluation of BSP)

BSP Evaluation - IQC Firms
IQC Contract PDC-0085-I-00-9087-00 Delivery Order no 05 to TVT.

PIO/T 1361595 $69,500 Aug 91

PIO/T 1361595 Amendment 1 decreasing 69,500 to 50,300 Aug 91

BSP Executive Committee
Minutes of one Executive Committee Meeting

BSP General Information
BSP flyer

BSP (Mexico)
Correspondence re Climate Change Initiative in Mexico

BSP (PNG)
Towards a framework for meeting conservation needs in PNG: a proposal $160,000 May 91

Background correspondence

Related proposals in/for PNG

BSP Progress Reports
Semi-annual Progress Reports 1, 2, & 3

BSP - Project Implementation Advisory Committee (PIAC)
July 1991 Agenda items

July 1991 Meeting minutes

BSP Publications

1991 Publications List of BSP-supported documents

BSP Research Grants Program

(copies of FAXes and other correspondence regarding RFP and proposals)

BSP Retreat

Highlights of 15 Feb 91 BSP Staff Retreat

BSP Work Plans (new)

Third Annual Work Plan 1 Oct 91 revised Mar 91

BSP Work Plans (old)

First Annual Work Plan Mar 89

Second Annual Work Plan Oct 89

BSP - Lake Tanganyika

(conference funded by BSP)

BSP - WRI

Colloquium on Sustainability of Natural Forest Management. WRI/CIDE. 21-22 March 1991.

Biodiversity Conservation Strategy. WRI-IUCN-UNEP

CBD FY'88

(discussions of PID, memos, correspondence)

ANE/TR/ENR Robert Ichord comments on draft PID:

"There is reason to consider in-depth assessments at roughly three-year intervals over the life of the project and to build into the Project Paper opportunity for redesign at each juncture."

CBD Budget Documents

(various)

CBD - Authorizations, PIO/T's

Action Memorandum raising LOP funding from 8.9M to 20M, and including ESF and DFA as possible sources of funding. 21 Feb 91

91

CBD - Vouchers/Waivers/Authorizations

(special waivers for Brazil and Peru)

Correspondence regarding change in accounting/reporting to show buy-ins as separate items (disaggregated). Feb 91

CBD - Issues from Original Paper

Memo from E. Thomas to M. Kux, providing clarification:

e.g. "Buy-ins should be for assistance and not for acquisition. Under assistance, AID will support or intensify the activities of independent organizations contributing to the achievement of Foreign Assistance Act objectives. Acquisition has the purpose of obtaining goods and services for direct benefit of AID."

CBD - Portfolio Reviews

APPENDIX E

BSP MID-TERM EVALUATION
SUMMARY OF MISSION RESPONSES

Prepared by John Wilson

1. How did you first learn about the Biodiversity Support Program? Has BSP done an adequate job of marketing itself?

Missions have generally learned about the BSP program through cable traffic, and personal contacts with BSP staff operating in the region. Opinions concerning marketing of BSP ranged from adequate to good. In the LAC region, there is some confusion over the differences among various sources of support for biodiversity conservation, including BSP, the Environmental Support project, RENARM, etc. Some questioned the need for so many different sources of support for this sector. BSP should clarify how it fits into the overall picture.

2. Were services provided by BSP delivered in a timely manner? ...a cost-effective manner?

Most respondents felt that assistance was provided in a timely, efficient, and cost-effective manner.

3. How would you rate the quality of the technical assistance provided by BSP? Rate separately for each activity.

Missions familiar with the details of BSP activities in their country are for the most part pleased with its high quality. Many missions rated the technical assistance as excellent.

4. Are you satisfied with the financial accounting and the technical reporting on project activities? Have you been invoiced in a timely fashion for activities completed under any buy-ins to BSP?

A pattern of weakness in financial and especially technical reporting has been revealed. This is one of the major problem areas for BSP. BSP has not provided regular reports to Missions on the implementation of their activities, even in cases when such reports have been requested. This has limited the effectiveness of information exchange and coordination of natural resource management activities by Missions.

Concerning financial accountability, many of the activities supported by BSP are funded with core funds. Tracking of these funds is not often of concern to Missions. Expenditures of funds provided through Mission buy-ins are also not tracked effectively. Several Missions have requested invoices from BSP. Rough estimates have been provided--none of the Missions reported receiving full, current accounting of expenditures. Several Missions have reported that the above weaknesses have made them wary of committing further funds to BSP.

5. What has been the most positive aspect of your involvement with BSP? What was the most negative?

Positive aspects of BSP involvement for Missions include the availability of additional funds to support mission programs, BSP's mobility to respond to opportunities and needs of Missions and host country organizations, its ability to deliver high quality technical assistance, and its field-oriented perspective. Missions remarked on the high quality of the BSP professional staff, their sensitivity to the local needs of Missions, host country governments and non-government institutions, and their collaborative manner. BSP has also provided a tool to support worthwhile biodiversity projects at times when local Missions were incapable of undertaking these programs directly.

Several negative aspects of the BSP project were noted. A chronic problem was the failure of BSP at times to keep Missions informed on ongoing activities in country. In some instances Missions were completely unaware that certain BSP activities were being funded in their host country. In most cases, BSP has not provided regular reports to Missions on implementation of activities. This appears to be a particular problem for those activities that have been core funded, especially research activities. Several Missions were forced to expend significant effort tracking down information on BSP activities. The result has been a lack of coordination with Missions, foregoing opportunities to leverage interest and funds in a fashion that would be mutually advantageous to BSP and Missions, and advance overall environmental/natural resources programs.

Another potential problem with BSP concerned its emergence as an independent agent, operating with a growing territorial instinct. BSP staff have claimed not to work for WWF, or the other consortium members, but rather for BSP. Funds granted to BSP become the institution's funds, not AID's. Even more upsetting to one respondent, BSP was beginning to be perceived as operating in an independent manner, with staff appearing in the region without country clearance. The results are that projects and programs may go off in different directions, without strategic objectives. AID fails to receive credit for its support for natural resources management activities (another chronic problem), and difficulties may arise for Missions operating in difficult and sensitive regions.

6. Has involvement with BSP led to fresh and innovative approaches to natural resource problems? Has it led to further programming of biodiversity related activities by your mission?

According to many missions, BSP involvement has provided a valuable mechanism for advancing conservation issues. In a number of cases, follow-on activities have resulted. Programming in support of biodiversity conservation has increased, and sharing of information has helped enrich overall efforts for preservation of biological resources. For missions with small

staff and limited capacity, BSP has provided a useful tool to implement an environmental program. In one case, however, BSP involvement resulted in additional problems for the Mission. Support for the creation of a Conservation Division in Belize led to shifts in GOB staff, additional work for them with no new resources, and the results of this effort have been less than satisfactory. Perhaps the most beneficial outcome has been the demonstration of an approach to avoid, emphasizing the importance of community-based conservation for future actions in Belize.

7. Can you point to any indicators or other evidence that BSP has, in effect, helped to conserve biodiversity in your country?

Noting that BSP has not been operational for very long, many missions still pointed to positive results from BSP-supported activities. In several cases, BSP is developing an information base that will inform policy deliberations and establish baselines from which to gauge future progress. In Mexico, BSP has done much to ensure the continuity of protected areas conservation. Other indicators of impact include the attraction of funds from other donors for conservation actions.

8. Should BSP's principal mission be the support of AID missions and bureau's or should its principal mission be the support of AID-assisted country governments and NGOs?

Centrally funded projects such as BSP should work through Mission programs. The AID Mission should be the conduit for any and all AID assistance to the host country, and BSP should not act independently, in the absence of Mission concurrence. Working through Mission programs or simply with their concurrence, technical assistance provided by BSP can be effectively channeled to support host country and local institutions' efforts to carry out biodiversity conservation programs. For small country programs, BSP has played an integral role assisting Missions to address environmental/natural resource management concerns. BSP serves as an important source of technical assistance, provides additional resources, and helps Missions to expand their range of contacts and exchange of information. BSP has helped improve the capability of host country environmental NGO/PVOs to strengthen their administration/management capacities, improve their local technical expertise, and transfer appropriate technology.

9. How would you qualify BSP's role in assisting your mission to fulfill the requirements of Sections 118 (conservation of tropical forests) and 119 (conservation of biodiversity) of the FAA? A. The only mechanism used; B. The principal (but not the only); C. One of several mechanisms; D. Inconsequential; E. Our mission has not undertaken any activity with the specific intention of fulfilling the requirements of Sections 118 and 119.

Most missions felt that BSP provided a useful mechanism for responding to the concerns of Sections 118 and 119 of the FAA.

In most cases, however, it is not the principal or only mechanism.

10. In your country, which question on biodiversity do you find the most vexing -- which natural areas to conserve or how to conserve them?

In some countries, the critical areas for protection have already been clearly identified. In other instances, the question of which ones to preserve has not yet been fully answered. Still, the majority of the respondents stated that how to manage natural areas is the most important challenge. Management efforts to conserve biodiversity supported by BSP are proceeding along various lines. In the South Pacific, land tenure issues may be paramount. In other cases, the question of how to fully address and incorporate the presence of local communities into parks protection and management is the most critical.

11. BSP was designed for 10 years with an initial five year Cooperative Agreement due to expire on Sept. 30, 1993. Do you feel at this point that S&T should award a new Cooperative Agreement to continue BSP for another five years beyond 1993?

The general consensus was that BSP should be extended, but with modifications. BSP should strengthen its relationship with Missions, closely coordinating and even co-programming activities. Improvements should be made in reporting to missions on BSP programs. The issue of core funding vs buy-ins should be fully explored--Missions believe the level of core funding should be increased so that BSP can provide more services at no cost to Missions. The past trend of operating as an independent entity, without close collaboration with missions, should be reversed.

APPENDIX F

Appendix F
Biodiversity Support Program
Field Activities by Region and Country

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: Africa			
Buffer Zone Management Proceadings	12,500		IN9003
Central Africa Climate Change	0	400,000	PD9102A
Central Africa Climate Change Project	0	100,000	PD9002F
Biodiversity Analytical Projects	0	928,800	PD9102C
Biodiversity Portfolio and Strategy	0	112,000	PD9102B
Lake Tanganyika Conference	50,000		TA9008
AID Biodiversity Portfolio for Africa	10,000		TA9007
	72,500	1,540,800	
Nearshore Nurseries of Lake Tanganyika	13,000	0	RE90534
Burundi	13,000	0	
Conservation Education	19,000		IN9104
Central African Republic	19,000	0	
Congo Basin Assessment	15,670		TA9009
Congo	15,670	0	
Kiang West National Park Plan II	0	250,000	SP9101
Kiang West National Park Assessment	15,374	90,000	TA9002
Gambia	15,374	340,000	
Conference on Women and Biodiversity	2,500		IN9010
Biodiversity in Sacred Groves of Ghana	15,000	0	RE90549
Ghana	17,500	0	
Park Planning in Southern Province	22,114		TA9001
Guinea-Bissau	22,114	0	
Use of Giraffe by Oromo People	14,960	0	RE90523
Indigenous Gardens for Maasai	13,822	0	RE90526
Fig Tree Harvest and Impact on Primates	5,740	0	RE90525
Kenya	34,522	0	
Andohahela Nature Reserve	0	54,944	PD8902A
Beza Mahafaly Nature Reserve	0	44,529	PD8902B
Endangered Keystone Palm	14,892		RE90517
Butterflies as Biodiversity Indicators	15,000	0	RE90532
Sustainable Use of Malagasy Rainforest	14,390	0	RE90529
Madagascar	44,282	99,473	
Edible Woody Species of SE Nigeria	15,000	0	RE90536

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: Africa			
Nigeria	15,000	0	
Comparison of Fishing Techniques	15,000	0	RE90522
Mafia Island Marine Park	25,000		TA9102
Tanzania	40,000	0	
Africa	308,962	1,980,273	
Region: Asia			
Conference on Borneo	15,000		IN8905
Strategy and Analysis	0	100,000	PD9101B
Small Grants Program / Asia		65,000	PD9101E
AID Regional Conference	0	70,000	PD9101A
Program Officer/South Pacific	0	90,000	PD9101C
Environmental NGO Conference	0	25,000	PD9101D
	15,000	350,000	
Teknaf Game Reserve Biodiversity Study	14,970		RE90513
Bangladesh	14,970	0	
Herbivory Impacts (grant returned)	0	0	RE90521
Wild fruits of Arunachal Pradesh Forests	8,650	0	RE90543
Buffer Zone Restoration	0	50,443	SP8901
India	8,650	50,443	
Environmental Assessments of Project	0	150,000	PD9104
Senior Advisor to PHPA	0	114,000	PD8904A
Dipterocarp Regeneration in Kalimantan	13,970		RE90510
Dipterocarp Mast Fruiting	3,500		TA9010
Training for NGO Staff	28,500	0	TR9005B
Mobile Park Seminar	28,200	0	TR9102
Indonesia	74,170	264,000	
Annapurna Conservation Area Proj (ACAP)	0	100,000	PD8903A
Nepal NECTARI	0	50,000	PD8903B
Biodiversity of Shivapuri Watershed	12,660	0	RE90528
NECTARI Report			TA8901
Proposal Design Workshop	15,000	0	TR9002
Nepal	27,660	150,000	
Himalayan Jungle Project	0	30,000	PD8904C
Pakistan	0	30,000	
Conservation Needs Assessment	0	160,000	PD89C4D
Reseeding Logged Forests from Bufferzone	14,800	0	RE90533
Conservation Needs Assessment	10,000	0	TA9101

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: Asia			
Papua New Guinea	24,800	160,000	
Frugivory in Pteropodidae	16,381	0	RE90518
Philippines Foundation Design	2,000		TA9006
Philippines	18,381	0	
Profitable Environmental Project (PEP)	0	145,000	PD8904E
South Pacific Data Center	0	65,000	PD8904B
Priority Ecosystems Inventory	25,000		TA9004
South Pacific	25,000	210,000	
Horton Plains National Park	15,000		RE90511
Medicinal Plants Assessment	16,000		TA9003
Sri Lanka	31,000	0	
Flora of Thailand	12,000		IN8903
World Bank Meeting on Biodiversity	3,610		IN9004
Sustainable Development in Buffer Zones	0	162,363	PD8901J
National Botanical Assessment	0	40,268	PD8901C
Information Transfer	0	25,000	PD8901B
NGO Seminar on Conservation and Environ	0	20,000	PD8901D
Speaker for Climate Change Conference	0	2,147	PD8901K
Pilot Projects	0	25,212	PD8901L
WFT Small Grants Program	0	47,000	PD8901E
Field Ecology Courses	0	44,570	PD8901I
Research and Facilities	0	93,363	PD8901H
Florula Project	0	65,000	PD8901F
US Study Tour	0	27,344	PD8901A
Vegetation Survey of Western Thailand	0	30,000	PD8901G
MANRES Project Planning	4,000		TA8902
Thailand	19,610	582,267	
Asia	259,241	1,796,710	
Region: Europe			
Biodiversity in Central Europe	0	800,000	PD9105
Central Europe	0	800,000	
Merja Zerga Land Use Study	14,850	0	RE90548
Morocco	14,850	0	
Europe	14,850	800,000	
Region: L. Amer.			
Debt for Nature	5,000	12,392	IN9002
Rainforest Products Report	0	16,295	PD9002A

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: L. Amer.			
Eastern Pacific Coral Reef Restoration	16,586	0	RE90524
	21,586	28,687	
Conservation Division in Belize	0	100,414	PD8905C
Belize	0	100,414	
Amboro Inventory	0	40,000	PD8905F
Land Requirements Based on Hunting	10,600	0	RE90531
Strip-Shelterbelt System in Bolivia	15,000	0	RE90550
Vicugna Management in Altiplano	13,350	0	RE90547
Forest Inventory	4,552		TA9005F
Bolivia	43,502	40,000	
Macroeconomics for Decision-Makers	0	100,000	PD9004
Biological Dynamics of Forest Fragments	0	74,183	PD9002C
Restoration of Degraded Lands	0	93,818	PD9002D
Amazon Forest Management and Policy	0	317,085	PD9002B
Goeldi Museum Publication	0	3,000	PD9002E
Biodiversity Use by the Guaja	14,950		RE90508
Lago Mamiraua Ecological Station	4,009		RE90507
Pantanal Rapid Ecological Assessment	15,000		RE90505
Brazil	33,959	588,086	
NGO Training	0	35,109	PD8905E
NGO Manager Training (supplement)	4,891	0	TR9003
Caribbean	4,891	35,109	
Botanical Conference Support	2,000		IN9108
Impact of Seaweed Cultivation on Estuary	14,708	0	RE90519
Flora Patterns of Central Chile	15,000		RE90506
Chile	31,708	0	
Rio Buritaca Watershed	13,348		RE90515
Restoration in Lowland Choco, Colombia	15,000	0	RE90539
Colombia	28,348	0	
Parataxonomists Course	0	100,168	PD8905A
Monte Verde Cloud Forest	14,250		RE90512
Non-Priced Amenities of Monte Verde	15,000	0	RE90530
Sea Turtles and Local Participation	14,393	0	RE90540
Butterfly Farming in Costa Rica	15,000	0	RE90537
Parataxonomists Course (supplement)	40,000	0	TR9001
Training for NGO Staff	25,000	0	TR9005D
Costa Rica	123,643	100,168	
Ecuador Cloud Forests	0	78,805	PD8905B
Economics of Land Clearing in Ecuador	12,075	0	RE90341

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: L. Amer.			
DESFIL and SUBIR participation			TA8903
Ecology Field Course	22,359	0	TR9101
Ecuador	34,434	78,805	
Production Systems and Impacts on Biodiv	13,500	0	RE90544
Guatemala	13,500	0	
Les Arcadins Marine Park	0	110,000	PD8905D
Haiti	0	110,000	
Vertebrate Inventory in Rio Platano	15,195		RE90509
Honduras	15,195	0	
Training for NGO Staff	25,000	0	TR9005C
Jamaica	25,000	0	
Montes Azules Research Volume	15,000		IN9106
Sustainable Development	0	60,560	PD9003C
Environmental Education	0	30,000	PD9003F
Community Development	0	86,000	PD9003A
Community Development	0	70,000	PD9003D
Mexico Ecodevelopment Project II	0	810,000	PD9103
Participatory Appraisal Training	0	29,400	PD9003E
Buffer Zone Development	0	78,000	PD9003B
Entomological Inventory of Lacandon	15,080	0	RE90535
Ethnobotanical Resources in Manantlan BR	15,000	0	RE90542
Human Use of Biodiversity in Tehuacan	15,153	0	RE90520
Training for NGO Staff	26,847	0	TR9005A
Mexico	87,080	1,163,960	
Sea Turtle Research	15,000	0	RE90527
Panama	15,000	0	
Butterflies of Paraguay	14,323	0	RE90538
Paraguay	14,323	0	
Rio Abiseo National Park	15,000		RE90514
Legal Research for Peruvian Government	14,500		RE90516
Regeneraton in Strip-Shelterbelt Systems	14,399	0	RE90545
Peru	43,899	0	
L. Amer.	536,068	2,245,229	
Region: [Global]			
Subscriptions to Conservation Biology	3,000		IN9107

Activity Title	Core Funds	Buy-in $$$	BSP code
Region: [Global]			
Forests and People Conference	25,000		IN9102
Biodiversity Seminar Series	5,000		IN9101
Biodiversity Seminar Series	5,000		IN8901
Workshop on Marine Biodiversity	2,000		IN9006
Biodiversity Funding Mechanisms			IN8904
Workshop on Marine Biodiversity			IN9109
Publication of Gnusletter	1,000		IN9007
Priorities Setting in Biodiversity	49,754	0	IN9005
Forum on Ocean Conservation	10,000	0	IN9105
Biodiversity Investments Survey '92	105,000		IN9103
Investment Survey for 1989	35,000		IN9008
Biodiversity Seminar Series	5,000		IN9001
Tropinet Newsletter	11,000		IN9009
Biodiversity Investment Survey	35,000		IN8902
Women in Development	0	20,000	PD9005A
Pacific Science Symposium	0	19,000	PD9005B
CITES Convention	0	10,000	PD8906A
ISEE Symposium	0	10,000	PD8906B
ISEE Symposium	0	5,000	PD8906C
Wetlands Report	0	13,179	PD8906E
Ex Situ Report	0	20,901	PD8906D
Org for Econ Coop and Develop. (OECD)	0	0	SP9002
Training Manuals for NGO's	11,029	0	TR9005E
Wildlife Conservation Course	14,425	0	TR9004
	317,208	98,080	
[Global]	317,208	98,080	
Grand Totals	1,436,329	6,920,292	

APPENDIX G

Appendix G

BSP Evaluator's Briefing Book
September 1991

CONTENTS

-96